

clear
Bay happens
that wasn't done.

Fr. Carsons

DAN QUAYLE

*nyho 50 hake + prob
up abundant
1 hly in the
past 1980 section.*

November 18, 1980

I sat and talked with Rich Galen for quite a while in the office before going in to see Dan. We talked about how the campaign had gone after I left and what happens once you get elected. A lot of the talk involved the early call of the victory, who called it in, where people were when the news came (Mark Miles was in transit somewhere and couldn't be reached etc.)

Afterwards, they had a staff party on Wednesday, and on Friday morning Dan was back in Washington meeting and tending to business. "First you get a lot of congratulatory phone calls." He talked about the sharing of an Indiana Service Office with Lugar. They will have one person, _____ Corwell who heads the state operation. He was Lugar's man and Satellite offices in Evansville, Jeffersonville, Fort Wayne, Lake County. They will do casework, projects and non-legislative issues in Indiana. Each Senator will have his own press person, scheduler, and political person in the state. He says that the idea came to them when he, Mark and Mitch _____ "were riding around Indianapolis killing time before the election." Mark and Mitch (Lugar's AA, I think, have known each other for a long time. They are excited about that. It will, they think, save money, be more efficient and even help Lugar's reelection (if it works) since they can say that the system will be abolished under a Democratic Senator.

Appropos Dan's pitch that eighteen years is enough for any Senator, Rich said "Someone said to me, 'He'll be vulnerable in 1992.' I said 'He'll be president then.'" I said "I was going to ask him how he felt now about his..." And before I could finish, Rich said "The 12 year limit. It will work out perfectly. Reagan will be a one-term president. Someone else will have it for 8 years and then he will run. He'll be 45--Kennedy-like." He went on to discuss the jockeying among the Democrats already - Bradley,

"We've been in a pissing match with Terry Dolan and NCPAC for the last week. Dan went on the Today show and said that he didn't think NCPAC had anything to do with his victory. He said that our polls showed that NCPAC and the moral majority had a net negative effect of about 4 points on our vote. Dolan got mad and went on TV, blasted Quayle and then gave a list of the next 20 Senators they were going to defeat. We've gotten some mail on both sides, some congratulatory, some not. Some of the fundamentalists are screaming. I told Dan that one thing he had to remember was that he wasn't the congressman from the 4th district anymore, that from now on everything he says will be reported in the press and remembered six years from now. But that was typical Dan Quayle. He follows the conservative line; but every now and then he goes off on his own... He doesn't want to be taken for granted. It's been kinda fun. But we won't keep it up much longer." Story about Erlenborn and how he toes party line and doesn't get reward from Rhodes.

When I went in to see Dan, I congratulated him and he smiled and said "You sure did pick an interesting time to study the Senate. How far back would you have to go in history to find a comparable period--1946?"

I talked about 1912 and 1928 and we wondered when the popular election of Senators began and we talked about whether Carter was the aberration and the conservative trend was only by Watergate. We agreed it had been. He emphasized the Class of 1978. "The Democratic Class of 1974 was not elected on the issues. They were elected on an anti-Watergate, throw the rascals out theme. The issues have been with the Republicans all through the 1970s." I responded "And the class of 1974 kept their seats through constituency service not through the issues." He said "Yes. But Birch Bayh couldn't hold Indiana through constituency service. You can do it with a house seat but

not a Senate seat. There's no way I can personalize Indiana. You can go around the state and give people the feeling you've been there, but you can't have that intimate contact you can have in a district. Maybe you can do it in South Dakota. But Indiana has 5,000,000 people. That's a lot different than 500,000."

He then proceeded to go through the Indiana Congressmen and had a comment on which ones should have won and lost. "We only picked up one seat. We should have picked up more. I say we had poor candidates." He mentioned the one vs. Jacobs, Sharp and Fithian, i.e. "he couldn't speak the King's english". Then he went on to say that Evans should have been beaten by Crane but that "there's a classic case of constituency service of there ever was one." And he talked about Evans' Burma Shave type campaign where he stands by the road with signs - "I am not a lawyer" "I am not a psychiatrist" "I am not a professor" (Crane was all of these things.) They said, Rich or Dan, "It's hard to like Crane; he doesn't give off any warmth."

Rich and I left while he talked with someone; we talked some more. I asked him to what extent Reagan's campaign was tied to their campaign. "In the broadest sense, we went up and down together. If Reagan had bombed, we would have been hurt, no doubt about that. If we had won by 10,000 votes, I'd have no hesitation in saying that Regan gave us the margin. But not with 164,000 votes. What worried us most was that Reagan would blow the debate with Carter and the whole organization would sag. Instead, Reagan won the debate and you could feel the tremendous lift everybody got from it. From that time on I felt we couldn't lose it. Our last polls showed us 8 points ahead, which is just about where we ended up." Rich predicted 100,000 and all the rest were between 5 & 20,000. The size of their margin was a surprise to them.

Dan said "You had a classic contest between two philosophies; and people want the conservative philosophy. In Indiana each side starts with about 40% of the vote. That's just the way it is. Indiana is a strong two party state. You start with 40% and the rest of it is what you get on your own. There are 40% of the people who just love Birch Bayh. Our polls showed that 20% of the Republicans supported Birch Bayh. They think he's wonderful. Our polls also showed that 30% of the voters wouldn't support Bayh under any circumstances. He was tough. He is as good a campaigner as there is anywhere in the United States. Everything a candidate has to do, he does better than anyone--from shopping centers to a strong speech and everything in between. He is a text book candidate. But his campaign lacked one thing--a theme. He started with a theme--that he was the effective Senator, the experienced legislator, the Senator who got things done. But he found that it wasn't getting him anywhere. My argument that 18 years was enough was very potent. He saw that we were gaining in the polls; he got scared and abandoned the effective Senator theme. He didn't put anything in its place. He just jumped from one thing to another; and every time he tried something new, we knocked it down. Then he'd try something else. First he tried to saddle me with NCPAC; but I disavowed any relationship with them and told how I had told them to stay out. Then he tried the argument that I hadn't accomplished anything for the state; our answer was that I was only a congressman and a member of the minority, too. Then he criticized my attendance record; I couldn't believe that. He has one of the worst attendance records in the Senate and we were laying for him on that one. Then he got more worried and started talking about the Ku Klux Klan and about how people would lose their social security. He was desperately trying to get at the voter by telling people they would lose everything if I won.

He just thrashed around for the last month and a half, jumping from one theme to another. He didn't stick to the one theme he had. I don't know whether that theme would have won. His big problem was the times and the economy.

We stuck to one theme--that 300,000 people were without jobs, and that Birch Bayh was to blame. Our polls showed that people blamed the Democratic Congress for the economy, but that they didn't blame Birch Bayh. They wouldn't take that second step. My style was to blame the whole Democratic Congress for the economy, not just one Senator. After all, you can't blame one person. But when our polls showed that people were not making the connection I changed. I said "Birch Bayh and Jimmy Carter cause inflation. Birch Bayh and Jimmy Carter cause unemployment. I wanted them to blame Birch Bayh. When you cancel out the effects the two candidates had, the money spent, the television, the organization--and those things do just about cancel out--he was done in by the times and by the economy. He would have had to have swum hard upstream to ever be elected Senator in 1980. The state we were in ~~was~~ too much, even for a candidate like Birch Bayh."

Don't forget, his margins were never that big anyway. He only won by 51% in 1974. But for Watergate, Lugar would have beaten him."

"It was a tough campaign. He's a fighter. And you had to listen to him talk all the time. It was different against Roush. It was a quiet campaign. You went around to shopping center and kept a low profile. In this campaign you had to keep a high profile. Both sides had to be heard. The media, as you said, is the difference. In a Senate campaign, when you go somewhere, you have to get media attention. You can't afford to miss it. In the House campaign, if the media doesn't pick you up one time, you'll be coming around to hit 'em again soon and so you don't worry about it."

He talked at lunch and later, as we parted about his committee assignments. As we parted he summed it up pretty well. "When I see you

again, I'll have a surer idea of what I'm doing--with the committees and all. I had a couple of drinks the other night and was thinking about what committee I r-ally wanted. Appropriations could be good. But there's no creativity there. You can't get down to the ground level and build like you can on Finance or Energy. You can cut, but you can't innovate. I want to specialize, but I also want to save myself to go where the action is. My golly, you can do that in the Senate--with 100 people. Appropriations would be good in that way because it covers everything--every area. Still, the creativity thing bothers me. And I have to be realistic too. Maybe I couldn't get Appropriations or Finance. As you can see, I'm still sloshing these things around in my mind."

"I know one committee I don't want--Judiciary. They are going to be dealing with all those issues like abortion, bussing, voting rights, prayers. I'm not interested in those issues and I want to stay as far away from them as I can. That committee will really be something with Strom Thurmond leading the charge and with Orrin Hatch as chairman of the constitutional rights subcommittee."

Said he talked with Baker, who said that only man who was even in Senate in 1952--last year Republicans took control--and that was Milton Young and he's leaving. Barry Goldwater had just been elected in 1952. So he's only one left. Question is what do we do?"

"Our campaign went in a straight line. He changed. First he didn't want a debate. Then when he saw he was behind, that nothing he threw at us had any effect, he wanted debates. Then at the end he wanted debates but didn't want them televised. First he didn't want to give us exposure, then he decided he wanted to give us exposure. Then he decided we were getting too good at it and so he didn't want us to have exposure. I was having fun toward the end. The more desperate he became, the more control we had over the format.

He talked about differences within the Republican party and the differences between the conservatives and the New Right. "Some of these New Right people really want to turn back the clock. They really want to wipe the voting rights act and affirmative action and all the civil rights gains off the books. There's no way they are going to do that. People like me won't let them. They're going to find a lot of difference between talking and trying to actually round up the votes. Conservatives have very different ideas than the New Right about where we ought to go."

Said he met East and found him "accommodating" but like Jesse in his views.

Rich says that they will bring in from campaign staff only Mark Miles, an assistant to him (guy who did field organization) and women who did fund raising accounting) to run correspondence system. Plus himself.

Dan Coats, his successor, came to lunch with us. He was meeting with people who sat on Committee on Committees, was looking for a house, interviewing an AA and being besieged by people running for party offices--Kemp, Shuster.

I saw Quayle and Grassley meet each other for 1st time. Congratulated each other and asked what each wanted for committee assignments. Grassley wants Agriculture but Jepsen may not give it up.

Dan said "We ran a clean campaign. There were a lot of crappy things we could have used--he abused the franking privilege twice, according to the Senate ethics committee, the matter of the 1500 that somebody, him or his staff, took in the thing--but we never did. We never abused him or went after him in a personal way."

Rich said (when we talked re Culver). "The lesson is that you should never

punch your opponent in the nose." (Not sure what he meant.)

Rich was Stoner's press secretary. And he talked intensely about how even though he lost, he came "highly recommended" as a press secretary to Abdnor and Quayle. There's a professional network of media people who make that judgment and winning has nothing to do with it. Dan has fired a succession of press secretaries!