

11/12 - 1220
A Land

Paul Tsongas

March 10, 1981

I went to the office and was working on the appointment books when he asked me if I'd like to come along while he talked to Fletcher School group. Then I walked with him while he voted and then we talked in his office. I asked about the career.

Ind summary
✓
"There was a definite period of confusion and wandering. It lasted for a year--from election to about September. We didn't know what we were doing. We didn't know what issues to work on. ~~It lasted for a year from election to about September. We didn't know what we were doing. We didn't know what issues to work on.~~ I was running around the state like a madman. The problem was that I still thought of myself as a congressman. But I wasn't a congressman. And I had twelve times the territory to cover. You need to make judgments about what you want to do. We began to do that. We had the Chrysler Loan, the Massachusetts plan, the ADA speech and now the book. We've had one and a half productive years."

✓
"I felt we hit our stride last year when we got the Chrysler bill through. Whatever you think of the bill--it showed we could accomplish something. The conservation bank, the solar bank, Alaska Lands, too. The ~~Mass~~ product of the office was excellent. We found out that what we put our minds to we could do very well."

✓
"We made some changes in personnel in the office. We added two people to serve as political outreach. We were *isolated*. We were good on issues, but we were not good on outreach--to groups. We tended to be a floating island, not attached to anything out there. We needed people to pick up things, to listen to what people were saying. We needed people to spent time in the state.

We needed to have a stronger sense of being rooted into a larger resource base. We wanted to do more than what the 44 of us could do. Frank Daly is up there and ² Sandy Naimen is down here. But we send him up for a week too."

✓ "The ADA speech was explosive. I worked for months on the Massachusetts Plan. No one else had ever done anything like it. It was good. But you could have thrown it in the ocean for all the splash it made. I worked for two hours on the ADA speech and I couldn't keep it a secret if I had wanted to. It developed a momentum. Ten days before the election Walter Mondale's office asked for a copy. Pat Lucey wanted a copy. Exxon covered it in their annual report. Things like that happened. The criticism of it was that it only said what was wrong and was not ^{pre?} descriptive. In November, I started running around the county developing some of the ideas. When the election results came in, I knew it would be important. I started to write a book in December. Then the publishers agents started bidding for it. That's a world all by itself--the publishing industry. Here I am with an end of March deadline."

out
frank!
✓ I asked him about his initial reaction to the Republican control of the Senate. "Depression--not because of Republican control, but because it meant losing so many friends who had been defeated by conservatives who were not their intellectual equals. I went through 3 days of depression. It was obvious to me, however, that this was an opportunity, that what I had been saying was going to be heard. A friend came up to me and said "Paul, you went from heretic to prophet in 24 hours.' The ADA speech had given me credibility. It was important that I had said it before the election. I had a first draft by the middle of December. I began to be interviewed constantly. A number of newspapermen have said ^{to people:} ~~that~~ if you are writing about the Democrats and where they are going, the first person to talk to is me. There

was the sense that people should touch base with me. This will be the first book out. It will be [^]case of first impression. I think it's pretty tight and coherent. I have spent so much time making it good because I do not want the moderates or the conservatives to think it is shallow. I want them to respect the thought process. I want them to read it."

I asked him how he was doing in the polls. "We're in good shape. At the moment, I'm the second most popular political figure in Massachusetts. When Mike Dukakis announces for governor, he'll be the second most popular. Right now, he's first."

During the Fletcher School talk he talked about his career. None of it was new, but it ended up with "This is the best job there is." "The six year term gives you time to think. In the House, you just finish packing away the decorations from the victory celebration when someone announces against you and you have to start campaigning again."

"You are much more visible in the Senate. In the House, there's more competition from your bright, ambitious colleagues. You don't have that problem here. (laughter) There is more power in the Senate. Take my book. If I had been exactly the same person, written exactly the same book, said exactly the same things, as a House member, no one would have been interested. As a Senator, the publishers are competing with each other for the book."

"If you worried about what your colleagues thought about your vote, you would go crazy. After all, you have to live with yourself. You don't want to live with that skitterishness [^] And there is a life after Congress. You don't want to have that skitterishness for the rest of your life."

"If we've ever been in a watershed period, this is it."

"I didn't vote on the Clark nomination. I was up in Boston trying to save the Boston Bruins--something that was a quantum measure more important than voting on a state department official who needs a globe so someone can show him where Zimbabwe is. Besides Haig knows where he's going. Clark isn't

going to impart a new direction; he's just going to have to hang on for the ride."

"We won't have any hearings on South Africa in this Congress. If we had won, I'd have been chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, and the first item on my agenda was hearings on South Africa. But the minority has no power."

"There is a lot of anger among the Democrats now. They are feeling very aggressive. All the gentlemanly club-like indulgence that the Senate is known for has now become an irritant. The Democrats know that their friends who lost were maligned in the last election. They are angry at people like Jesse Helms because they know that those people will stab you in the back."

✓ He spoke of the split between "the revisionist Democrats and those traditional Democrats who think that if you want to get the word you go talk to George Meany." Among the revisionists, he said, "We'll have the first book out." ✓ He commented that some Democrats want to give Reagan all of what he wants and then be there to pick up the pieces. I asked him about it later and he said. "I don't want to give him everything and I don't want to lead a crusade against him. I just want to save him from his worst mistakes."

"I can remember walking down these halls as a congressman and being in awe of the Senate. Now that I'm here, that seems ridiculous. It's all too real. It is imposing from the outside but it's not imposing from the inside-- not when you see who makes policy. When I go abroad and have to defend Senate policy, and I know who made that policy and how I sometimes have a hard time doing it."

✓ When we walked over to the vote on Metzenbaum Amendment he said "Two years ago I would never have worried about a vote like this one. Liberals are against decontrol and I would have been against it. Now I have to be

✓ rational and consistent in my approach. There is no economic argument for control. People will say to me--you know we can't have an energy policy based on artificially priced oil, so how can you vote for decontrol. And I have to admit that I can't. I attack the conservatives in the book for their myopia. I can't be credible if I display that same myopia on the other side. I have to show a willingness to rethink the issues if people are going to take me seriously. I have done that--starting with the Chrysler vote. And it has given me a great sense of freedom on the issues.

I waited while he voted. When he came out I asked. How did you vote? "I voted against the Metzenbaum Amendment. So did Bill Bradley. That's interesting. He feels the same way I do."

✓ I asked if he felt like a part of any group in the Senate--like Bradley, etc. "No, I'm not a part of any group. I work alone. I haven't made any social friends in the Senate--not in the sense of getting together after hours. My friends are still in the House. If I go to a movie, it's either with my neighbors or with someone from the House. My wife and I never go to other Senator's houses one on one. Part of it is age. I have a young family. But part of it is the greater volume of demands on you. In the Senate you are surrounded by a staff of 48 people. In the House you had only 18, so you had to rely much more on your colleagues. In the House I came in with a group; we shared common experiences; we felt like a group. There is none of that here."

Do you go over to the House at all? "Sometimes I do. But not as much as I used to."

Do you use the House gym. "No. It's too far away. Besides, they put in the Senate gym, so there's no need to go. And it takes too much time."

You once said that the test of your Senate affiliation would be whether or not you left the House gym. "The real test would have come if they hadn't put the nautilus machine over here. It gives me something to do in the Senate gym."

Do you feel you have a niche in the Senate? "Yes, I feel very comfortable in the Senate. And it's not social. I think people respect me. The Alaska Lands issue had a lot to do with that--among Republicans as well as Democrats. I understand there are little cliques that get together in the afternoon for drinks. Not only do I not do that, I don't know who they are or where they meet. But I think people know that my word is good. I also think people know I will give them a hard fight, but I don't fight just for the sake of fighting. I think the Haig nomination was important in that respect. I've told you that I wouldn't have stayed in the House. But if I leave here, it won't be because of the job. It will be because I want to be with my children or because I want to go home to live or something like that."

Would you still go back to Lowell? "Yes, my wife and I just put more money into our house there." Later, in his office, he said "My wife and I were saying to my father-in-law last night that if I had stayed in the House, we wouldn't have been able to keep our home in Massachusetts. We couldn't afford it. We talked about all that implies for a sense of presence in the state, losing touch, and losing the feeling of accountability you have to the state."

At one point in the day he asked about Bill Cohen's book. "All your guinea pigs are writing books." I said it was his reflections on events, that it was episodic and, as such, captured the episodic nature of the Senate. I said he liked to write, and that the book was rather poetic:
RF - When he sees a sunse that moves him he writes about it. When he sees

a sunset, he sees infinity."

PT - When I see a sunset I think, My god I missed my plane.

RF - Well he sees infinity, you see finity."

In the office, during the job interview with Bob Arseneau, he said to him "We take a much tougher attitude on staff requirements than we did two years ago. Now we're moving into the center of things; and if somebody on the staff screws up it has ramifications well beyond the 48 of us. After the election (Dennis interjected 'after the Schlesinger letter') we got the staff together and we told everyone that we're moving to center stage and that the work will get harder and our standards in judging staff performance will be stiffer and that if you can't stand the pressure you'd better get out. We have different expectations now than we had.'" That's what Chris and Debbie had said.

The two other things he told the guy were that he wanted a staff that was "self motivated." "It doesn't make any sense to use staff energy going around acting like a policeman." And second he stressed "You need political sensitivity in what you are doing. To you a letter may be a pain in the ass, but there's a human being on the other end of the line with a complaint. You don't see that person, but I do. And when someone comes up to me, 'I wrote you a letter and I haven't heard from you' I don't want to find that letter under some staff member's chair down here because it just seemed too complicated."

On way back from vote, he also said "Just now, a man who generally opposes me but who knows that I voted for Watt and who knows that my votes on Watt and Haig were the opposite from what would have helped me back home--he saw me standing there working on some notes. He asked me what I was doing. I said "I'm trying to explain why I'm voting decontrol.' He said, 'You, voting for

decontrol? I'll buy a copy of your book." That's just the kind of response I want."

✓ "On person read the book and said it was 'compelling'. I couldn't ask for a better comment." At another point he said "One of my friends in the House said to me 'We Democrats need something to read.' I said to him, that's just what I'm going to give you. I'll be the first to give him something."

He says he works whenever he can on the book. "At parties, when everyone else is having cocktails, I'm off in the corner writing my book." He said it was 10 pages first draft and that it's now 300 as he keeps adding and developing ideas. His deadline is end of month.

I first saw him in action with about 40 Fletcher School Students. He was substantively impressive, as much of the questions were ones he had addressed in the book. But he came across more aggressive than I'd seen him and, I think, more confident. That is, his aggressiveness is not free floating and expressive. He's got something to say, he thinks and he wants to be the first to say it. My summary description of Paul this trip is that he's like a boxer who is in good trim, has come to fight, and won't sit down on his stool between rounds she's so anxious to mix it up.