

PAUL TSONGAS

August 10, 1982

top of 99 me -  
-Purdy

How about 2 years in the minority? "It's been much more enjoyable the last two years than the first two years. For the first two years I always felt history was moving against us. We were declining. The election demonstrated that. WE were on our ass. But now things are going our way. We had a change and people can see it hasn't worked. It's a lot more fun now."

✓ "I don't use power like a lot of people around here. I'm not interested in patronage or perks; and so I don't miss any of those things about being in the majority (Subcommittees?) I miss the Africa subcommittee. I think I could have done a lot with it. But it's a minor thing, really, compared to the things I talked about in the ADA speech."

✓ I asked about the issues he has been involved with since the book. "High tech--the Japanese problem occupied most of my time till the ERA came along. And now there is the whole Middle Eastern-Lebanon problem. The Foreign Relations Committee has had such a full plate of things. El Salvador, the freeze. That has kept me busy. And I'm still involved a great deal with Lowell--that's a constant. I have backed away from the Energy area. The problem there is that you can't get anything passed. Under Carter we got involved in the conservation bank, solar energy, photo voltaics. But under this administration you can't take any initiatives. Nothing is happening. So you walk away from it. You go on to other things. As soon as I saw the Republican close ranks during the budget and reject all amendments, I knew things would be different. There is a completely different atmosphere around here now than there was during the first two years."

goes to when you

How about your "five issues." "Psychologically and philosophically I am still interested in those issues. But times change. Issues come and go. If you stayed with one set of issues, you'd be standing in a backwater. If Africa becomes as prominent as El Salvador, I would be in the middle of it. The Alaska Lands issue took an enormous amount of time. If an issue like that came up again I would get involved. But it isn't. There's nothing happening. For now, it's the backwater. There's <sup>not that</sup> no excitement about getting into a new issue, sitting in committee and learning something you didn't know before."

?  
check  
OK  
change  
for 1979/80

Has the book had an impact inside the institution? "It's had more impact outside than inside the Senate. There are so many ways people judge you around here by whether they like you or not. The book would be one of a great many criteria by which I would be measured here--and not one of the top ones. But outside, the book is all that most people know about me. It was a success in that I didn't bomb. People treat it with respect. They believe that neo-liberalism. The book has helped bring about a beginning of something different--along with the ideas of Hart, Bradley and others."

Is it a guide to voting? "I voted against the Kennedy-Metzenbaum jobs bill. People were surprised. But it was consistent with my book. Of course, the situation is different. Now it's a matter of no program or a little program. It used to be a matter of a big program or a modest program. I think about the book but it's not what I have in my head when I go over to the floor to vote." (smiled)

We got into a tangle about Mother Jones and how far left he really was. "The idea that I'm a closet liberal is wrong. The difference between

✓ myself and Tom Hayden--whom they were comparing me to--is that I'm not anti business. I like businessmen and I'm comfortable with businessmen. Whether that's because my father was a businessman or because I worked with businessmen in politics, I don't know. Not the National Chamber of Commerce. They are as ideological on these extremes as Bella Abzug on the other. I mean the kind of businessmen I've always dealt with in Massachusetts. In Lynn, they had a big downtown rejuvenation celebration, and they held it off until I could be the featured speaker. You can't imagine them doing that for Tom Hayden can you? I want to move people to the center, not to the extreme. Don't forget I gave my ADA speech before Ronald Reagan was elected, not afterward.

✓  
✓ "If I had wanted to move to the left, I certainly wouldn't have taken the position I have on the Middle East. I've been critical of Israel, and I'm getting killed for it. I wouldn't have done that would I? I am getting killed in terms of a national constituency. I knew exactly what would happen. If I had wanted to run for the Presidency, I certainly wouldn't have made the statement I've made. And we had conversations about that here in the office. But I didn't<sup>it</sup> because I felt it was right. I feel very comfortable with myself. There are a lot of people who agree with me. But for them, they <sup>are</sup> go into a lot of other issues. For the people who disagree with me, there is no other issue. Sometimes I think I have a perverse tendency to take on issues that get me in trouble. The other day I spent two hours arguing the pro PLO position with a group of Jews. The next day I argued the pro-Israel position with a group of Arabians<sup>s</sup>. Finally I threw up my hands and said "A pox on both your houses." That came from my soul. I felt so good



after I'd said it--almost cleansed. I'm very comfortable with what I've done. I've followed my instincts. On the first day I spoke on Lebanon, I did it in committee, no cameras, no press release. It just came out-- "enough is enough." It got picked up by the New York Times, Anthony Lewis and others. But you can't say I did what I did for political advantage."

"I think I've been a good Senator--a better Senator than a Congressman or a Lowell City Councilman. (Because of institution? or because you have changed?) I haven't changed. It's just been luck and circumstances that are different. Lack of competition for one thing. If all those people had not been swept away in 1980, I wouldn't be leading on these issues, they would--Bayh on ERA, Church and McGovern on Foreign Relations. My ADA speech came at just the right time. If it had come in 1984, it would have been swamped. If it had come two years earlier, no one would have listened. It came when we were on our ass. The most important thing I have ever done was the ADA speech. But I had no idea at the time I gave it that anything would result from it. I just followed my instincts. I don't know how four years could have gone any better for me than they have."

Are you thinking of the next campaign? "No, it's not in the front of my mind. We have started fundraising. We took a poll and the results were so good, we don't know what to do. There were no obvious differences to work on. No one out there is planning to run against me. Whatever I'm doing, I must be doing something right. Dennis is into the campaign now. But I'm not. Just do my job as well as I can. I guess that's what I'll do."

You've never felt far away from Massachusetts have you? "I love Massachusetts. I love it more now than when I first came to Washington..

We like living in Washington much better than we did living in Virginia. But I love Lowell more than ever. We are spending more time there than we used to. We were lying in bed last night in Lowell and I asked my wife 'how would you feel if we lived here permanently?' She said she'd be very happy--that we'd always travel and be involved in issues."

Do you feel blanketed by Ted Kennedy in Mass. politics? "No. I'm interested in different kinds of issues than he is. And I feel there's a generational difference. His time is now; my time is coming. I have established a separate identity. I have never thought much about that problem or felt it was a problem." I said his staff felt competitive and he nodded; but he didn't pick up on it.

"What worries me now is that the Democrats are so completely anti Reagan that they don't feel any need to take any new positions on issues. I'm trying to arrange to give a speech at the National Press Club. I want to tell Democrats that just to be anti Reagan is not enough. Not many Democrats are thinking that way around here right now. You could see it at the Philadelphia mini Convention. It was pure anti-Reagan. That's all it was. That bothers me. I guess I'm resigned to being a maverick."

I asked re sugar bill. "We're going to bring it up on the debt limit bill next week. We've done all the work. That's a good example of staff taking the initiative and doing something good. One reason I've had such a good four years is that I've got a good staff. We've some shaking down to do--not by the standards of most offices. Our economic development group back in the state took a while to shake down. I can't tell you how good it feels to know that while I'm down here the outreach operation--the constituent service, the economic development areas --is taken care of, that it's grinding along in a professional way. The people who do that

are excellent. We had trouble at the beginning because some of the people we took from the campaign did not come across as credible in the economic development area. They were well intentioned. You get torn between loyalty and competence. Loyalty plus general intentions do not equal competence. We had to remove some people who had been with us in the campaign and replace them with people who knew economic development."

Said they spent more time in Lowell than on Cape because "parents are fine, but they can be wearing". He'll have a town meeting in Orleans."