

PAUL TSONGAS

September 19-21, 1978

Pat Foley, Jerry Fallon, Elaine Baltus, Toby Dilworth, Jeff Apfel,  
Lou Barlow, Fred Faust, Fred Woods, Kerry Magnan, Chris Bryant<sup>and</sup>, Dennis Kanin,  
Rich Arenberg, Joel Singer, Maria \_\_\_\_\_, Judy \_\_\_\_\_, Nick Rizzo.  
Nancy<sup>W</sup> Gilmartin (who worked for WEEI).

Interview with Rich Arenberg - Re baseline of past votes against which  
to judge. "We were flying blind... There's just nothing you could compare it  
to. Dennis and I had guesstimates as to what CDs would look like. Nothing in  
recent history to compare it to. It was a unique race. Quinn primary--something  
to go on with turnout but not much to go by.

"We probably drew the liberal vote very well. Guzzi people sensed this  
and tried to change strategy - to call it blue collar vs. liberal. Never  
really worked. Paul is an ethnic kid from cities--even though he's Ivy League.  
Comes across very pragmatically. I never thought view that G & T would split  
liberal vote had any credibility. Neither Paul nor Paul was perceived as that  
kind of person. Massachusetts liberal is strange person. There is that hard  
core of liberals and the great unwashed out there who <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ not liberal.  
Kennedy made it respectable for those people to vote liberal and Paul had great  
deal of support out there. Very important to our strategy. We feared Guzzi  
would be perceived as the liberal vs. Brooke; Paul would be shut out and that  
would dry up our funds." "Guzzi and Tsongas would split the liberal vote and  
Alioto would win," said the Globe. It magnified importance of what Guzzi was  
doing. And that Globe analysis bought us the time we needed." "Opposed to  
fear that media might write us off and paint Paul as a minor candidate. If

Globe tomorrow said we were 25 points behind, we could not raise any money."

"I never feared going one on one if Paul could once get even with Guzzi because Paul had more substance."

"We're 50-50 with Brooke. Paul is at 65% in name recognition. That leaves 35% to introduce himself to. He has never had more than 10% unfavorability in any poll we took. If he ever gets ahead of Brooke, he'll win. He's the kind of candidate that's hard to catch. It would have been hard to catch Guzzi if G. got ahead. Paul wouldn't take gloves off and there's not much to punch <sup>at</sup> ~~out~~ with Guzzi either.

Brooke: A classic <sup>problem</sup> ~~poller~~ for incumbent <sup>who</sup> starts even. He's got a different <sup>issue</sup> ~~choice~~ choice. He can choose to run on record and attempt to dramatize it in a way that strengthens him."

"Does a liberal vote vs. <sup>the</sup> only black Senator? <sup>"</sup>big problem for them. He says some newspaperman summed it up." "Are Massachusetts voters mature enough to vote against a black man?"

Poll data as early as 1975 - Harrington interested - saw EB vulnerabilities. "People like him, but it's thin. There is a vague sense that he hasn't done very much, no real accomplishment. Ask about Ed Brooke and you draw a blank and then there's whole thing about his being absent from the <sup>state</sup> ~~vote~~ vote. The crucial group is the <sup>independent</sup>, issue oriented, 128 ring around Boston segment that votes Democratic <sup>but</sup> crosses over to vote for Brooke!"

Thing that got me really interested in Paul vs. Brooke was 5th District poll - <sup>E</sup> saw attitudes congealing, a toughening attitude about Brooke. There was a vague dissatisfaction bubbling to the surface here and there. EB was ripe for someone to focus issue and give em a reason to vote vs. Brooke. The Globe story about his finances helped in that. It was a circuit breaker-- those suburbanites have cut out and won't come back to Brooke. There's a share

of his previous vote that is lost to him. People aren't shocked by criticism of Ed Brooke. Tough criticism is less shocking today than a year ago."

Re polls: <sup>polling</sup> The in-house goes back to 1974 race. Use own volunteers 25 or 30 people trained and veterans of 15-20 polls - he defends in-house polling. "I'm dedicated to the objectivity of the poll." Has better motivation. "We tell them that if you don't want to do the poll, the only person you'll screw is PT." Superior to commercial polls.

Have done 25-26 polls since 1974 - did them periodically. "It gives you a way of holding the superstructure <sup>we</sup> of your organization together in non-campaign periods." "Keeps <sup>the</sup> skeleton together."

February or March. 1st talk re Senate race. PT upset with Panama Canal vote. "This makes me so angry that he's playing around with it that I'm thinking of running vs. him. I even talked to Nicky about it last nite."

"If you're halfway serious, let Dennis and I think about it." Dennis and Rich develop memo - "best shot at Senate he might ever have."

PT was coming to Massachusetts - talked to a few people. "When he came back, <sup>he</sup> had decided not to run. <sup>The</sup> Lowell Park Bill <sup>had</sup> almost passed in House and on way to Senate, <sup>like</sup> if he announced, bill ~~would~~ be killed quietly in Senate. He felt so deeply about it that it brought all discussions to a grinding halt. Couldn't argue about it. That was fact of life."

Went back to normal

In April - normal poll was taken. Took look at Brooke "as we often did." Saw hardening of attitudes toward Ed Brooke in southern part of district. Enough to make us reopen the question with Paul. Rich didn't think PT would take it up again - didn't want to go through emotional rise and fall again.

But PT intrigued by figures and Park Bill was on floor of Senate so Brooke couldn't kill it.

PT says let's do poll of me vs. Brooke in 5th District. Came out 2-1 (roughly).

They knew 5th was not reflection of state, but they felt 5th was "a bell weather".

These 2 polls were done in 1 1/2 weeks.

Rich then polled Lynn, Hingham, Brookline, Wards 5 and 6 in Boston (Beacon Hill and South Boston), Sudbury and (maybe Worcester) - thought of it "as a congressional district or something." Asked about congressman in each district to build a "composite Congressman vs. Brooke." PT 12% known - 20 points behind Brooke - "Saw nothing to make vs change what were generalizing about Brooke from 5th District. Not prepared to think of it as representing state-wide." Consistent with "gut hunch" - "it put the campaign into gear, although we weren't prepared to go ahead without a statewide poll."

Rich and PT meet - Paul will go to Globe to sound em out and R prepare poll. Same day he goes to Tip's office and finds out Tom will announce and decides not to go. Tom changes mind in a week.

Another in term poll done in the 5 towns. "We were walking <sup>around</sup> ~~and~~ telling each other how relieved we were that we could have a normal camp <sup>sign</sup> and a normal summer." Mother's Day - "PT calls and said O'Neill isn't running and we've <sup>"</sup> been running ever since."

Never did do statewide poll. But had benefit of T. O'Neill's numbers <sup>+ what they</sup> looked like. Never a question after that--Rich thinks O'Neill is executive type and wants to stay here.

PT calls O'Neill and tells him that if he runs he won't. "We felt we had to have the nomination for the asking or else we wouldn't have a chance of beating EB. The reason was that we would not run if we had to run a tough primary. We wouldn't have challenged Guzzi either."



When Guzzi got in - "A formidable opponent known statewide. He's so much like Paul - liberal - as Paul says he is athletic dark, Mediterranean type." Very few Democrats who raised serious problem for us and PT immediate reaction was "if PG is in we ought to get out." G. vacillates.

A kind of pride about Paul's morality - about seeing things through. Candidates in 5th already declared - couldn't go back. "What Guzzi did to us is something Paul would never do." They had assurances that Guzzi wouldn't come in. Rich felt they were strong assurances, some vagueness.

June poll by an outside <sup>o</sup>grup.

"At this point, we were pressing hard to get organization together and didn't want to use resource of <sup>our</sup> "most talented and committed people" at that time.

✓ The national poll became the benchmark poll - 24 pts. behind. Set groundwork for strategy we were to hold to all the way. Showed PG better known but extremely soft, "as soft as any recognition ~~as~~ I've ever seen." Few ready to pick his name out.

✓ Rich felt: that PG was soft and race could be run by getting PT known, his record known, keep it positive, should not say anything unfavorable about PG - no need for that.

"Being unknown can be a big advantage. Being slightly known can be a big problem. PG had trouble being discovered because people already knew he was there. If they don't know you can get people to listen to something about you."

Rich talks about group - "I'm making <sup>the</sup> case <sup>for in-house</sup> ~~has~~ everything." - around Paul. They know Paul well, clicked, talent, etc. He said other people commented on this - "who are those crazy white hats?" Professionals have formula and plug it in. Guzzi's people never understood his strength and weaknesses.

✓ "Media - <sup>our media</sup> ~~our~~ people did know Paul and <sup>an</sup> grew out of <sup>an</sup> effort to go with what he could do. There's an integration in our campaign that's hard to understand if you

operate a hierarchy of consulting groups that operate by memo. Our great strength is informal contact. Paul gets credit. Absence of ego. He's aggressive, ambitious and that usually goes along with large ego. Paul is very different. Has 1st two characteristics and doesn't seem to have the third. It's created an atmosphere for people who work around him. There's no problem of access to PT. It frees people around him <sup>from</sup> artificial competition that builds up out of need to have ear of congressman. Absence of infighting that enables us to operate in informal, cooperative way. No one has to defend <sup>Paul's</sup> ~~turf~~ in order to get to see the candidate.

I asked if there were any "threads" linking this campaign to prior ~~ones~~ <sup>ones</sup> areas.

People told him he was crazy to run for city council - <sup>Paul's</sup> ~~hairbrained~~ to run for County ~~Commissioner~~ - crazy to run for Congress - same thing when he ran for Senate.

1st <sup>early</sup> ~~in each~~ poll 24 down - about 36 - 12 or 38 - 14 .1) ~~early~~ <sup>early</sup> poll

Polls in summer - 1) Markey Poll 2) DNC polling open districts.

Rich doing 2 polls in the 1st and 3rd week of August. 1st = 2 pts. down. 2nd = 4 pts. This one really was "panic button" poll and hadn't expected to do the 1st one--but did to monitor TV ads.

1st poll showed everything we projected was happening. We wanted to see what impact media had had. Wanted to know whether visibility ad was working and we saw it was. It was the time I stopped worrying about the race. I thought it was right on the track.

'Tickets' grew out of original congress campaign. How do you ever get around the horrible problem of the name. How do you made the connection? Fred went out and stopped lady and asked how do you spell Tsongas. They came up

with all kinds of spelling and giggled and laughed and it was a great ad. Our first thought was whether we could do the same thing to open the Senate race. He fought for it.

Ads designed to be direct and personal, to go with strength Paul had as a candidate.

He wanted last ad to be "tickets". "I felt that race in the end would be decided by people electing someone who wouldn't know all that well in the end. Best thing was to tie Paul back to that <sup>Kid</sup>~~kid~~ in campaign without any issues or cutting edge. He's a nice guy who can laugh at himself. In the beginning I said this would be won by the nicest guy. By the person who was known as the nicest guy in the race."

This was year when there was big undecided group. He thought people would go out to vote at bottom of ticket for state Reps, etc. and would pull a lever on Senate campaign without having thought about it much or having gone there because they were interested in the race. I pictured people looking at 5 names with different degrees of vague familiarity and here was this strange name and the good feeling connected with it. ~~PT~~

Again idea that unknown has chance to get message across.

"Pt. was here is a guy who is really qualified, who can really talk to you, who has depth. If we thought it was specific issues we wouldn't have talked about <sup>p. 24</sup> photo <sup>etc</sup> election calls in the ad. We'd have talked about his position on the natural gas bill."

"It was a characterization - qualified."

"We were lucky. He was the only Congressman in the race. There's a certain stature that comes with that. I think there's a reversal about "the Congressman". "The President" without the name comes a lot more clout than if you say President Carter. With "Congressman" it's the reverse - the stereotype of cigar smoking

bad image that everyone runs against. When you talk about Congressman Blank, there's an assumption you have to knock down. It was important that he was Congressman Tsongas. That alone wasn't enough. If it weren't for the fact that he was more substantive, the cutting edge with Guzzi wouldn't have worked. But it opened the door. When people learned he was Congressman from Lowell and people tended to take him seriously and then listened to his message."

Talks about Paul as having contradictions. "He's a mystery to many people. He's got the shortest attention span of any intelligent person I've ever known. If he wants something, you'd better give it to him up front to make sure he gets it because you don't know when he's stopped listening. He reads very little for a person of his intelligence. But he has the best gut instincts of anyone I've ever known. Also, I want to write a book about the racquet ball influence. He plays racquet ball with some of the most obnoxious conservatives and it enables him to cut deals with them that he otherwise could never do. He made some of his most important contributions to the Alaska Lands Bill because he played racquet ball with Don Young and could engineer compromises with him. He works legislatively in the quietest way with people very different from himself. If he enters a crowded room, he'll go straight for the person with whom he disagrees the most to find common ground. He's not a we-they type of person."

PT came to Headquarters shortly after I got there. He said a few interesting things and did one interesting thing. When someone said that Ted Kennedy's office called to say that Kennedy will call him in an hour, Paul threw "the finger." Dennis turned to me and said "You can't print that!"

Paul said "This is a time for great savoring. We took on Guzzi, Martilla, Hill, Holiday and the Boston Globe. If we win in November, that will be nice, but it will never replace this one."



He got call from Guzzi - a number of comments. "Early this morning I thought you had beaten me... As I told you that day in the parking lot... You and I are the only ones who understand that.... If had won, I would be the one calling you to offer my help. I wouldn't have been bashful.. I think you should bring Nick Rizzo in on that... Yesterday you had me worried. When I was in Stoneham shaking hands, this airplane flew overhead flying a big Guzzi sign. It was as if the Lord above had zapped me."

When he got off the phone he said "Guzzi is 100,000 in debt. He took out a loan, and Mortilla kept spending the money at the end. That's a terrible thing. I'll help him. As he said to me "It's in my self interest to help you." Otherwise, how will he ever get rid of that debt. His wife Joanne is crushed. But she had no trouble going after us all during the campaign."

Then to his wife on the phone later he said that "the four of us should get together. Joanne is crushed. We'll have to be sympathetic."

"We'll have to take a conciliatory attitude toward the Globe--even though they pushed for Guzzi."

To Alan Sizitsky on phone. "I know you carried Springfield and the West. How come you didn't carry Waltham? Where were you when we needed you?" Kidding.

"We can plan strategy in a half hour. If we don't know now how we are going to deal with Brooke, we never will. Who's Ed Brooke?"

"Mortilla will have to explain how he lost with a candidate who was 24 points ahead in the polls and indistinguishable from all the others."

He talked about "Where else is there for Greek money to go" in wake of Dukakis defeat. Lots of intertwining and this is an example.

Press Conference. "If my name were Smith, I probably would have lost." Spoke of his appeal vs. Brooke - to moderate, liberal Brooke supporters--cities, peace corps, accessibility.

He called national issues "marginal" in next campaign - emphasized Lowell and cities, accessibility.

"I've always been able to bring in the suburban vote and the cities."

"Last night he said 'I'm dead.' Today in press conference, he said 'I'm going to follow a human rights policy with respect to my own physical well being...if that's acceptable to you.'"

In private meeting earlier he noted that he had met King (governor winner). "I said you had better move in the other direction. He just mumbled and I don't know what he said. But I don't think he knows what I'm talking about."

In that meeting he had been interested in victory of James Shannon in his district." He wants to do a Tsongas-Shannon bumpersticker. I told him that was fine." In newspapers it was noted that Shannon ran as Tsongas' supporter--only one to do that among 5th District Democratic candidates.

My observation is that individually, campaigns are fascinating, but collectively they are less so.

ym ✓  
In connection with PT being a "mystery", Rich also said that "He is thoughtful of others but he keeps a distance from others that makes it hard to get to know him personally."

One of first things Paul said in private conference was "Are we ready to do a poll. I think we should do one as soon as possible."

Question Dennis asked him was whether his press conference should include other candidates. Paul said "No. I think it's time I elevated myself (arms sweeping upwards) from the others. We'll do one of those later."

In attributing his victory, Paul mentioned first "The media campaign Mr. Barlow put together for me, the fact that we worked harder--my wife, my sister--than any of the other candidates and the literature drops in 80 cities and towns.

Other questions involved--would he support King (yes). (In private he said, "That will be some tandem."); Will Kennedy support him (yes); Will he make issue of Brooke's ethics problems ("If the Ethics Committee makes a report I will comment on it. If it does not, I will not bring it up. But I will emphasize my own practice of full financial disclosure. That's part of the openness, accessibility issue."

Again--the non policy issues.

When Paul first spoke at Dome, he singled out "The best campaigner--my wife Nikki", "The best campaign manager--Dennis Kanin," and "The best financial chairman--Nick Rizzo."

It's a measure of the contrast between House and Senate races that Rich talked about their TV ad in 1974 as follows: "We did one TV ad and it was awful. We only did it toward the end of the campaign because we had money we didn't know what to do with. The money came pouring in at the end and we decided to spend it. It was the first time anyone had done television in the fifth district. People felt pleased because here was a Boston station carrying a commercial to Lowell. But it was a bad commercial."

PT said "I'm glad Brooke won. I'd rather run against him than Nelson. He gives me the creeps--you never know what he'll do."

I think first or one of first questions Paul asked in private meeting was: "What do you think my name recognition is now?" Obviously a great preoccupation. This may have come on heels of his comment on how "great" it was at Government Center--where he had just come from shaking hands and saying thank you--to have people recognize him.

Interview with Joel Singer - 9/25. Describes self as a political--will take anyone who won't hurt him and who has money. Hicks no, McCarthy yes.

Hired to do media planning and buying but he had experience in all areas so they used him more. He discussed "purpose of commercials, i.e., fact that

they wanted him to be anti-politician<sup>1</sup> to play down Washington experiences because polls indicated that voters more interested in other things. Says he got involved and wanted to win. "I viewed commercial and <sup>found</sup> funds obvious problems--picked up a lisp - does he sound sincere and not like a desk pounder - energy spot - had introductory line that was unintelligible (Ashley blah, blah, blah) they changed it.

He "kept voice<sup>ing</sup> reservations." "If you are going to do the following thing, why don't you do it this way." Doubtful about 2 <sup>Fred's</sup> fields ability - now "I'm a believer." They "groped" their way, he said, but they came out OK.

Re ads. Timing was his important contribution.

"We needed to get a jump on Guzzi--hoping the campaign would pick up steam and money would come in. A "gamble" - can blow wad and nothing happens.

He said 300,000 would be needed for media - they spent less than 200,000.

Started with a 20,000 TV week, planning to build from there. In middle of 2nd week, funds dried up. "We wanted to build momentum and were faced with 2nd week of 18,000 and 3rd week of 5,000."

1st week they were on in Providence and next week they had to take it off.

"We had put most of our bag into TV."

Must have TV and yet it left little money for anything else.

"Cost per human beings delivered is very high in Providence compared to what you would get with Mass. people." "Had to completely give up on Providence since it would have emasculated the rest of the buy."

Pittsfield "automatic that we can't afford Albany TV. That's way out of line on priority basis."

"Cape was completely <sup>P. ignored</sup> because it was tabbed as Republican."

Worcester - problematical - also watch Providence. North of Worcester unknown territory.



Takes time for any TV schedule to develop reach. In one week you effect 40% of adult population in Boston. It needed extra time to establish message and build to 70%. It's amount of time and exposure we could afford. And with lack of IR had to go for extremely visible time periods right away - news, prime time and at most 7:30-8:00. No daytime or late night. Need to reach large number of people very quickly. Didn't need frequency per person early - needed to <sup>bring</sup> ~~buy~~ name of Tsongas to each person on minimum of <sup>once</sup> ~~one~~ reach.

*Ready* Large number few times, and counted on weight and length of campaign to build up frequency. Not interested in any one week's statistics. Assuming that tone and form of campaign would be consistent throughout and reenforce one another. Mostly outdoorsy situations, mostly soft, not being shown on House floor saying point of order! Couldn't start new campaign in middle of first campaign.

Tax for elderly was next spot - but when money ~~down~~ <sup>up</sup> in 3rd week "it screwed everything up." - then to park and then to energy.

He was very much vs. mixing up the 3 issue spots and in favor of carrying them *seriatim* He constructed it so that same people would see one spot and then the next "I was guaranteeing that same people would see everyone. It was truly a non issue campaign, even though we used 3 specific issues the idea was that it would be cumulative and not that people were upset about any one thing. Idea was that here's a person who is a nice guy. He is also broad, versatile, has done many things. It all hinged on his qualifications - wrapped up beautifully in closing tag line that "you've already learned my name and I'm a congressman who has accomplished things." We left this on for 1 1/2 weeks.

Who's aiming at? 1st everybody - 2nd geographic emphasis.

Knows program types and "demographic skews" he gets ideas from campaign -

"throw away 18-34's older group votes - have to cover Lawrence Welk,

p. 45 "Campaign for Cash" "mindless programs that reach lower socio economic class." (Tom O'Neill - he tried to influence "people close to him"!! - to make them think he was credible.)

Late in campaign "we bought a mess of time on daytime CBS to make sure that older women would have a message in their mind that this guy is a nice guy and reenforce feedback that older middle class women liked PT because he was like a son they would like to have as opposed to Guzzi who came on strong and brash." Did this to "shore up this vote and make sure it came out."

Porch spot - raised problem because people didn't understand it - had to cut it off early even though they all thought it was best spot from production standpoint - came off as human being.

He's done 1000 schedules - "relies on that experience .

Always studying rating results based on past.

7:30-8:00 is indeterminate - don't know supper patterns and can't afford a gap in there if you're looking for recognition patterns right away.

Late news for campaign contributors - upper educated people watch late news - don't watch early news, aren't home - late news is more sophisticated audience - part of schedule is designed to help with campaign contribution.

Re locking up time periods. Ch. 5 only one to accept political ads Monday before election - Patriots game blacked out - several candidates had bought 30 seconds at \$5,000. Gave each 2 spots on movie instead. Late news not available if football goes on. With blackout, late news available - but Joel ~~reduced~~ <sup>realized</sup> it "jumped in and bought it - no one else did."

"Last message in concept is very important. I stacked up the last night." Got a "make good" at 11:45 too because of his relation with media. Not obligated to give you make goods - only return money--for political ads only.

Stations limit what you can buy to keep free access for other politicals and commercials.

They don't officially book it till cash is there and don't have to have cash till 48 hours in advance "business 48 hours". But you can "reserve" time and if your relations are good, they will tell you if money is needed immediately to hold spot.

Must offer lowest commercial rates - offer you two prices - lowest and politically preemptible price and you have to negotiate the lowest rate by pressuring your "supplier."

You buy programming - not stations. Audiences not loyal to stations, only programs.

Welk - 2<sup>nd</sup> week → 4th week because of loyalty - have whole campaign seen by Lawrence Welk. Older audience → family programming - both emphasized. Otherwise he looked at ratings and tried to get bigger<sup>u</sup> overall audience for the buck."

Ch.5 ABC prices inflated. "Amount of audience delivered" is what you're after and have to judge efficiency of the buy. He went with "better value" not necessarily all ABC, since it cost more.

Insisted that they cover print in last week. Where are you weak, in geographical areas. Cover em with newspapers - coverage is broad with one insertion and no frequency, i.e., Fall River."

Broke 90% of total in state. He guesses (though he says not to use it) that they reached 70% of the people a minimum of 12-15 times--but he says who knows what the best measure is--sum totals of how much reached in each of the 5 periods.

Lunch with the two Freds

They began with discussion of different campaign situations and they emphasized situation. In their case, they had to get known in a crowd of people. Thought of doing something "symbolic" on TV "school for politicians ad "was one example - or experience ad showing cockpit of airplane and operating room. But decided to go with Paul as he was "We wanted people to get to know Paul Tsongas as he is." They think of him as anything but slick. "He's quiet, he mumbles and stumbles, doesn't look energetic, doesn't smile a lot, but he cares, he has more integrity than other politicians and people who know him, like him and trust him. He<sup>can</sup>/get things done. He's more of a technician than old line politicians. "People think he won't hurt them. But he will."

He won't change his views. "He'll never pull an Ed Koch." "He won't move to the right. If you think he's going to come out for capital punishment, no way."

Fred F. commented that people try to get him to smile, speak up, show more energy, take elocution lessons, etc., but that misses point that his natural charm is there and is potent. Plus the fact that he won't change anyway!

When I asked re links between way you campaign and way you behave afterward they came up with (1) he's accessible to voters in both contexts and doesn't go to people at only reelection time. (2) His staff is idealistic and flawed, not "Yankee efficient." (3) He delegates to others and Brooke doesn't. (4) His relations with press are excellent and that comes through. He's so open he hurts himself, but press likes it. (5) The constituencies you build during campaign affect what you can do in office. Note: It was not a good question because (5) was closest and it was vague and others were really personality traits.



14 ✓ Back to situation idea, they talked about key decisions in their situation as "Using TV as main medium." "The key decisions were announcing early and going on TV early when we had TV *entirely* to ourselves." They also talked about this unity that came with going back to "tickets" at the end which made Paul the only person that could be picked out at the end. Everyone was talking about issues, on TV at the end "Which name do you think people could remember, the guy who sponsored the asbestos law, the one who is against taxes or the guy with the funny name, the one who laughs at himself and is the nice guy." Then they told stories of how people recognized the sign at the polls. "Whenever the kids came by they would pronounce the name right or say "tickets". It shows what a subliminal medium TV is that it takes an 8 or 9 year old to say that. But the others must be thinking the same thing."

When we talked about difference between congressional and senate campaign they started in talking about money. "The county commissioner race is the worst of both worlds. You have a bigger territory than a congressional race and a lot less money to do it wiht."

Paul spent 125,000 on his congressional race vs. Cronin.

They talked a good bit about situations where TV is best and situations where papers are best. Markey brothers - Ed wins with big TV blast at end. Brother tries it and flops, since he had no natural base to begin with. John Markey was beaten by a guy who used only newspaper ads.

They noted that the expanse of a Senate race meant "A newspaper in Greenfield can be cutting the hell out of you and you won't have any idea what's going on."

With Brooke race, free media will change nature of things, from their standpoint. It indicates that they think in media terms pretty exclusively.

They noted that in terms of production values, Guzzi ads might have been better, but in terms of doing what they were supposed to do, they didn't accomplish anything. "There's a big difference between a commercial and a campaign." Points up the reenforcing nature of a campaign.

I kept trying to find out what their key choices were, but didn't get clear 1, 2, 3 view. Interviewing 2 people at once is tough.

non-establishment  
"Your media decisions don't depend on the nature of the race, whether it's congressional or senatorial. They depend on the structure of the media markets." Whereupon they talked about the common problem of having to buy Boston to get Lowell, etc. And how they went to Martilla and talked to him about Paul and he said Paul wasn't a heavyweight. Globe people don't cotton to Lowell types since Globe is part of the Boston establishment. They built up Guzzi vs. Davoren and hence they stayed with him. They think Globe might back Brooke to keep Mass. liberal image.

Other point re PT is that he had a record and that was a key part of everything done in campaign. Matt McHugh has perfect and cheap TV market, whereas leafletting all the little rural towns would not be easy. A lot of this kind of discussion.

I end a lot of discussion of PT's problem with the thought that there weren't an enormous number of strategic problems. There were a few ~~of~~ strategic problems. Should we get in? When should we get in? What's our main problem? Which media mix is best to solve it? What's our candidate's strength? How best to get it across? What is the competition like? Money, you always need but where to get it is, I suppose, a problem for the fund raiser. The really key strategic decisions that shape the campaign are those of timing, focus, message. These are based on certain assumptions about the context, your strength and weakness, and what credible means do you have for exploiting your strength.

It's a very hard process to get your hands on. And I found myself, toward the end, getting a little bored with the conversation about it. I'm tending to the view that while campaigns are exciting as individual horse races, they are very hard to generalize about with any degree of intellectual excitement. Maybe I'm just tired of the subject. But if the purpose of trailing PT is to get to the Senate, I'll have to just wait. Another possibility is that it all cumulates slowly and nothing has happened yet.

I spent the afternoon looking through their newspaper files and another thing that occurred to me was how much of what I have picked up also appears on the newspapers at one point or another. So, what's the use of my collecting all this stuff at first hand if it's all in the papers anyway? Well, I grasp it all better if I get it firsthand. And I pick up nuances. But the point is that unless I'm just chronicling campaigns, I won't make much of a contribution until it's of a theoretical nature; and my unease is precisely because I don't sense any generalizing, theoretical ideas growing out of my reflections on campaigns. That may just mean that campaigns, as such, aren't what I should be, or am, studying. It's something else. Careers?

The only face to face conversation I had with PT was on election night. I was sitting on the TV platform. He came over, sat down, didn't see me, did some figuring on percentage of the vote he had, turned to me and said "How are you doin." I said "I guess I'm the only person here who will say to you 'I'll see you in Washington.'" He said "I'm dead. I'm going to Washington Thursday and Friday for the energy bill. Then I'm going to the Cape for four days." Then someone grabbed him. That was all. But he let me listen to his talk with the staff the next morning--which may indicate some recognition of me. But it is of the rock bottom minimum. He has still shown no inclination to be nice or personally accommodating to me. The contrast with Cohen, who

*differs*  
treats me as a person whom he likes, could not be more vast. I have no rapport with Tsongas whatsoever. He may tolerate my presence if I accidentally bump into him. But he has no interest in helping me or building any personal relationship of any sort. And Dennis Kanin is the same way.