

TOM HUGHES

July 28, 1982

I asked him about staff changes over time. "There's a danger here. I don't want to shoot from the hip. But what I want to say is that our staff is nowhere near as able and as professional as it was 12 years ago. I'm not sure why that is. And maybe it's my fault... One reason for that may be that our staff is a completely Rhode Island staff. That is the Senator's policy--an established, firm, rigid war policy. It was established 18 years ago and has not been changed. That probably makes us unique. And there is not a large pool to choose from in the state. I know what a bright, active, informed young person looks like. I've helped other offices hire and there just aren't a lot of people in Rhode Island that fill that bill. So we are in difficulty right there. We don't hire from Johns Hopkins or the Woodrow Wilson School. We hire from Rhode Island. And in a lot of ways Rhode Island just doesn't cut it. We aren't among the 30 top Senate staffs on the legislative side--not the committee staff, but the office staff here.

A second reason for our staff problem is that we have a number of people on the staff who have been here since before I came [12 years] and they are suffering from burnout. The Senator is absolutely unwilling to exercise his authority to remove staff or even to squirrel staff away in some harmless committee. We have 4 people occupying professional positions on this staff who should be removed. It's not just that they aren't as productive as they were. It's the attitude that their presence conveys to others on the staff. It gets a standard. If he does only such and such quality work and has been here forever, I don't need to do any differently. Staff people on the Hill only work for personal satisfaction and when the attitude of the staff is that they are willing to find satisfaction by doing less than they could or should,

that's a problem. If you have a staff of 60, it doesn't matter; but with a staff of 16 or 18, it does. I don't know how to solve it... I've just written him another memo about staff changes. I know he won't do anything about it, but I've got to make a stab at it."

Do you choose from the campaign?

"No. There is such a small pool of people to choose from in R.I. that we don't have any need to narrow it down further. For the most part the people who staff our campaign, and some of them are very talented, are volunteers. They have political skills. They are good at organizing meetings, making voter contact. They do not have professional skills. In 1984 that will change; and I'm trying to get the Senator to understand that. We are going to have to have lawyers and accountants on the campaign staff. Our paid campaign staff people come mostly out of the state political ranks. After the campaign they find places in state politics, around the legislature. But we do not hire them for our staff. If you ask me whether there are any campaign staff whom we paid in 1972 or 1978 and who I wish we had on our staff, the answer is no. We do not use the campaign as a way to recruit staff. Now if you ask me about some of the inter^Nys we have had in Washington, do I wish we had some of them on our staff, the answer is yes. Some of them are mayors now.

Does office reflect "personality." "I don't think the office reflects the personality so much as it does the will of the Senator. I do believe that. The indecision and chaos characteristic of this office didn't just happen. It's because he wants it this way. Let me put it in reverse. 'If the Senator wanted the office to be any different, he could make it be different.' He knows that. We have talked about it; but he likes it this

way. So the characteristics of the office reflect the characteristics of the Senator. Sometimes we hire people who get terribly frustrated in the office, and they don't know why. They are super organized, management-oriented people who either leave or slip into the rather bumbling way we do business here. We had an LA who did a good job for us, not a super job, but a good job. He has been an AA in two other offices, where he organized a super efficient office for two Senators. But my point is that he couldn't have done that if his Senator hadn't willed it. We have a person here now who keeps a very neat desk. If the Senator asks him for something, he might be able to find it, but he probably will have thrown it away. If he asks me for something I can always find it--but it may take me an hour. It's very hard to put your finger on, but the character, the flavor, the attitude, the pace of an office reflects the will of the Senator."

I picked up on pace as one I could see. "The Senator has a very distinctive pace. It is basic to the way he does things and the way he thinks. And it is absolutely impossible to change it in anyway. He knows himself--not in a silly California way--but because he was brought up in a tradition. He doesn't think about 'who am I' all the time. He knows who he is because he knows what his family is. It's the family thing. He doesn't come here like Dan Quayle one day and say the next day I'm going to implement management efficiency because that's the thing to do. He came here and does what he does because generations of his family have come here before and done what they did. He's terribly proud of what they did. Look at those guys up there on the wall. There have been five Pells before him and I guess he figures there will be more after him. It's not that he's like his father. He's very proud of his father but very different. He isn't. Herbert

was an A type personality, died of a heart attack early. A lot of what Claiborne does, running, doesn't eat red meat, doesn't smoke, doesn't drink is done in reaction to his father. But it is a carefully thought out reaction. I would never "think of reacting to my father in this way. He has such a long view of things. He doesn't care if he gets his name in the papers; if it's not in today, it will get in some other day. He doesn't need a steady stream of legislative accomplishments. He doesn't worry about defeat. He thinks in terms of generations. That's what gives him--and the office--the unique pace that he has."

"I worry a little bit about this politically. You can get so relaxed that it leads to a Clifford Case or a William Fullbright or maybe even a Jacob Javits situation--we may have another one with Stafford--that I've been here a long time and I don't really have to work as hard for it as I used to. That's always a danger for people who have been here as long as Pell has. They often lose in a primary. I'm not too worried about it, because he really wants it this time. He wants it more than he wanted it last time. And he is willing to go out and get it. He does not have the noble's oblige attitude that 'Here I am, if the people want me, they can pull the lever, if they don't I'll leave.' He will go out and work for it. He may not go to factory gates early in the morning. But he'll do everything he has to do."

✓ "Politically, he is an anomaly. Here is this very blue collar, very ethnic, ageing population not only electing but almost carrying on a love affair with their patrician. I don't know what makes it work. They know he cares about the right things, but they don't exactly know what things. He's honest as the day is long; they all say that they know he's involved in foreign relations and that's OK. They see his picture in the papers with

the King or the prime minister and they like that. They like to have their Senator involved in such things. They think of him as a good man, a sympathetic man. Somehow it all works. But in the end you think maybe his career has been following and been guided by some star. That maybe it can't be understood. And that leads you to worry about whether you ought to try to change anything, and if so what. Or, should you just sit back, do nothing and trust that star, that magic, to bring you victory once again. As I say, most Rhode Islanders think of him as a character. Especially the elderly. The young people think of him as weird. We have a lot of trouble with the 18-21 year olds. They don't have any of that special feeling about him. He doesn't talk to their concerns. Unfortunately for public policy, but fortunately for us politically they aren't very active. And I don't know what it would take to galvanize them. The elderly are the most important force in Rhode Island politics. You must remember, Rhode Island has not changed that much since he was elected. We aren't like New Mexico and Arizona with lots of new voters. Change will come from within the state as the young people become increasingly important ^{but} was not; we hope, till after 1984."

"His stsuppose is not very deep. It's not very intense. But I can't see the voters throwing him out. First they would have to have a reason for turning out the incumbent. And second they would have to have someone they wanted to put in his place. Those are two separate processes. Sometimes the incumbent will hand you number one and you only have to worry about the second. We will not do that. I don't think ^{we} can be beaten."

On snapshot of campaign. "I'm not happy about where we are. I think we're well behind where we should be. I wanted to be doing fund raising

this year. The Senator indicated that he did not want to do it. Once he made that decision, I tended to let things slide. I've talked to a pollster. We haven't done any polls; but we have had the polls done for other candidates this year, and they are very satisfying. We wrote a telephone poll, but never carried it out. I'm one-third of the way through a memo which is a campaign document, in the sense that it raises questions that need to be answered-- (he ticks em off--campaign manager, polling, fund raisers). Jack Cummings and I talk about it all the time. My instinct is not to set up a committee until we have these questions answered. Many of them can be answered quickly. When they are, I can delegate the whole thing to someone else. Until then, I like to keep it in my own hands. Perhaps we could have group go away for a weekend--the Senator, his wife, the media person, (same one as last time), a pollster, a fundraising person and 7 or 8 staff. We would have an agenda. The trouble with that is that the Senator won't follow an agenda. He plays havoc with an agenda..." Phone rings, Pell wants him, Tom leaves and that's the end.

staff
C
"If you took a sharp shot of the staff as it was in 1963 and as it is now, it would look very much the same. The people would still be from Rhode Island. They would still have the same ethnic mix. The secretaries would come from the same kinds of families. The staff composition would not have changed much. But the state hasn't changed that much, either... Now that's not including the foreign relations staff. If you include them, there has been a big change. When the Senator came here he had two people whom you might call LA's. Now he has 25.. He has a personal relationship with nearly all the minority staff on foreign relations. It took a while but now he calls them up and they call him up directly."

The Labor Committee staff is from RI--at least they are people who worked in RI. Has got some initiators in there that he thinks will help--one on computer based education - a categorical program of sort RR "hates" but it will give him some election talking points.

"The economy is a bad subject for us. We have a case of a burned out economics staff person and a Senator who a) doesn't like to focus on economics and b) who, when he does, has some willful ideas that do not sound very good. The two people just pass each other without communicating. That's a serious problem for us. I was talking with some pollsters the other day who tell me that the growth in the economic knowledge and understanding of the electorate is phenomenal. They know about interest rates and deficit and inflation and money supply like they never did before. The economy is our worst problem. And the voters are going to expect to hear some economic theory--whether they agree with it or not--some intelligent economic theory from their senior Senator. I don't know what I'm going to do about that."

Hiring. "I've sat with him in 50 or 60 hiring interviews. With him, there's a chemical reaction that is the deciding factor. It takes me a long time to conduct a job interview. With him, it takes about 4 minutes to decide whether he can work with that person well or not. Still, we've ended up with a very disparate staff."

At one point he said Pell is "petulant" but went on to say more often he was usually different - I can't recall the comparison.

At one point another staffer poked his head in and said "It went very well. He spoke for about ten minutes. Stafford followed him; but Pell got much more applause than Stafford." Tom says "good". He'd been talking to some interns on education. I said "It helps to be the author of Pell Grants" and Tom said "It lasts." They were probably concerned about how well he would do.