

DENNIS KANIN

June 8, 1982

We went to the American Cafe and talked about Paul's post book moods.

✓ "There was a letdown. There were a few months there when he wasn't as engaged in legislation as he had been. The book came at a good time. What else could he do during Reagan's first year--just give him a shot at his own program. Now he's ready to plunge in again. We've been working for several months on several pieces of legislation to deal with the Japan problem. We're about ready to introduce them. Paul gave a speech about it in Boston last week. That will be a major set of initiatives for us. And he's taken the lead in reintroducing the ERA. We have sent around a Dear Colleague and gotten 35 favorable replies. He'll meet with women's groups later this week. Tomorrow he meets with some of the women in Congress. That may turn into something big. We're told the women's groups that we're ready to do whatever they want us to do."

I said that there had been no Alaskan Lands or Chrysler since the book and he agreed.

I asked him about 1984. "I'm beginning to think of reelection, but none of the rest of the staff is. And I don't want them to be." He seemed sort of reluctant to say this. He said they wouldn't start thinking reelection "till November." But after he described the staff, in the course of which he said "I like campaigns better than managing an office" or "I'm a campaign junkie", he said with a laugh. "I am in a 1984 mode, aren't I!"

They have raised 100, more by the end of this year. Nick Rizzo is in charge again.

We talked about the poll that came out this week. "I'm not sure I know what those numbers mean, but they send just the right message to anyone thinking about a primary. I hope every Democratic politician in the state

reads it. Anyone thinking of running against us ought to study those figures. I don't have a lot of faith in favorability numbers. A lot of people with high poll results end up losing. They don't show depth, just breadth. But it's sure better than having them go the other way I guess. People like him. One October poll showed the same thing.

The only rumors they hear involve Depper O'Neill and Evan Dobelle. Some talk of Heckler.

They did a poll in October. Will do one next month and every 4 months now till the beginning of 1984. They ran Heckler vs. Paul and it was 67-23 for Paul. They ran Bellatti and O'Neill vs. Paul in a primary and Paul was in the 70's against both of them (Yet Bellatti's figures were as good as Paul's. Maybe they just think of him as a good AG.)

"I can see two possible scenarios. One has us with a weak Democratic primary opponent and a weak Republican in the general. The other has us in a tough primary and a tough general. Who can tell. But we'd better be ready for the second."

He talked about his staff--first Washington and then Boston. They have good staffs and not much turnover. Some economic development turnover in Mass. An economics position created in Washington.

"We had never thought of having an economics position we came to think it's very important to have an economist on the staff. So we had to create an economics position. That was a major change. Otherwise, we have stuck with the original legislative assignments. They are all specialists. In the House, we didn't have any legislation specialists. We didn't need them. You weren't out front on so many issues as you are here. In the House, when you cosponsored something, that was a big deal. Here, it doesn't mean a thing.

Hired a press guy. Took quite a while to get rid of Doug "When he began writing speeches saying what Paul was ad libbing in his speeches, it was time for a change. We wanted someone who will bring in fresh ideas. Paul doesn't use speech writers too well. But we thought we'd get someone in with different ideas that he wouldn't use."

They looked for writing they liked but also for someone who would fit in the office. E.g. they rejected a guy whose clips were good but who said, originally when asked to bring his clips that he was so well known that they didn't need to have clips to judge him.

"We want a staff that works together well--where each person doesn't have his little area of expertise and his personal agenda. I think we've done that."

In Boston "We have good people in Boston, but they don't mesh together as well as they do in Washington. We've been through 3 state directors. I don't think Paul's presence here creates a stability that we don't have up there. I think we've got it worked out pretty well now. I hope they will all stay with us through reelection--if they don't kill each other in the meantime."

"We made a pledge to our House staff that they could all have jobs if Paul won the Senate seat. We made that pledge because they were good and because there was a lot of panic among the staff. They didn't think Paul could win."

He said that "the pledge" re hiring restricted the number of new people they could hire.

And, in the case of the Boston office, they made some mistakes. "We made a few mistakes. We hired people to do economic development because they had been good in the campaign. But they couldn't hack it in economic

development. We have replaced them. Our new development staff is excellent. I hope we can keep them through the election."

The new Boston office manager is a guy named John (?) Quinn. He worked with Paul on the Banking Committee and then ran for Congress in Maine --vs. Emery. So he's not local. I couldn't imagine any of the others doing this. "He's a good manager; but he doesn't know the personalities.

Re another change. "We realized that we didn't have good enough contact with local political people and state legislators. We weren't doing anything in that area. So we hired Frank Daley to do that. (I asked if any incident contributed to this and he said no).

Now he thinks of his 1984 organizations as having two parts. One is the advisory committee of local political people. "People who don't do the work, but whose advice you like to have." The other is the the volunteers, "the people who actually distribute leaflets and go door to door." Daley will work with the pols and Toby Dilworth will work with the volunteers.

A couple of emphases came out of this talk, on staff. One is that their original choices were influenced by the campaign, and they made a few mistakes, but not many. Another is the notion, which Rich also mentioned once, that they want people to share each other's work in some sense. They don't want isolated specialists. They want people to pull together. How do they get this? Not by stressing Massachusetts. Not culturally, that is. They get some via personality--to wit the story of the reporter who had a high opinion of himself. But they got it mostly via ideology. It is a very ideological office--by far the most of the ones I know. They "care" about liberal causes--the freeze, the Jews in Russia, rights, (Paul's big amnesty international posters)