

*my reflections on here, too*

Tim Burke - Nov. 20, 1986

When I returned the polls in the morning, Tim taped the CBS-Moyers segment for me and we talked a little.

"A couple of years ago, the idea began to get around that Mark Andrews was aloof--you know, the arrogance thing. I don't know where it came from. People may not have been able to put their finger on it. But people were just waiting for something concrete to come along and Conrad gave it to them. First there was the wheat ad, then the double talk ad and people said, "see, I told you there is something wrong with Mark Andrews.' We didn't answer the wheat ad for a long time. We had an ad where Mark explained that the farm bill brought less in into N.D. But we didn't answer the wheat thing. Then Conrad had an ad standing in front of a pile of wheat saying Andrews was for lower wheat prices. Then there was the \$2M missed vote--that Conrad said cost ND \$2M in unemployment funds. Mark was making a speech in Florida for which he got an honorarium and the vote was 49-50. He was the only one missing. The truth was that if he had been there, it would have been 50-50, Bush would have voted against it and it would have lost. Everyone I talked to--about two weeks before the election was talking about it. Again, we didn't answer it. The argument was that it wasn't showing up on our tracking polls. But on the street, everyone was talking about it. There was the idea that we shouldn't stoop to answer him. Finally we did have an ad that showed Mark leaning on a fence post, looking straight into the camera saying I'm not for lower wheat prices, I don't double talk. I never voted against social security etc. It was a good ad. People liked it." But there was the idea here that they didn't have to get in there and slug. In their polling they had a large # of questions pertaining to negative campaigning, legitimacy of Conrad's criticism. His ads grate on my nerves, etc. Tim says they did have an anti Conrad ad toward the end saying

he got money from Council for Liveable World, that Burdick gave money back to that organization. Seems very complex and buttresses Alan Ehrenhalt's idea that it was hard to be anti-Congrad because had had no record. And they couldn't attack Durgan. He's too popular.

Tim and I talked about what there was out there that made people think M. was aloof. He made point that "People aren't really comfortable around Mark. Whether it's his size or what I don't know. (I said, as I said to Jacqueline 'He's not a backslapper.') People in N.D. expect their officials to sit down with them so they can call them by their first names. People call him Mark, but they aren't sure they should." He is standoffish and doesn't plunge in. That's the Abdnor distinction. It may be the Burdick distinction. I remember in Valley City where he sat with Mary and people had to come up to him. Even in Lehr it was respect and not one of the boys that I saw. I saw "one of us" but not "one of the boys."

He also mentioned Durgan's impact on ND politics and I agreed that there was a generational problem here. Mark did get caught in a double switch - he missed the press release revolution. And he was a long time in the House. It was Milton Young's revenge in 1986.

Tim caught this. "On Tuesday, Strom Thurmond had a meeting to talk about how the Senate could be made to run better. Mark may have put his finger on it when he spoke up and said that he had been too long in the House and that he had acted too much like a House member, like a minority House member. He didn't develop a national point of view; he didn't become senatorial. Everything he did was directed at North Dakota." What an irony.

I have often written that he acted like Appropriations Committee member. He has that view of a legislator. For Mark, legislation means getting money for things. But that translates into "clout" or "getting things" and not specifics. It's hard for people to remember just what you did when you shovel money in. The only specific thing people mentioned was Defense warranties. And that was Mark's main "legislative" initiative.

*Learn into  
how new  
phases - MFA  
is old phase.*

As a legislator, Mark is a special kind - he's a pork barreller, a deal cutter, more than a substantive coalition builder.

It's an old warhorse kind of story. It's not like he's over the hill. He could, as he says, keep on doing this for a long time. But it's as if a new style was becoming more appropriate. All the editorials spoke of his seniority and what he gets for ND. And he felt that he should be rewarded for all this pork. Interesting that Whitten came to his party, that Stevens came and that he voted for Stevens--who is same kind of legislator. But he was constituency-oriented, for sure. Tim says he went home a lot.

There are two sides to a House Appropriations member

- 1) power in the chamber, i.e., the ability to affect others
- 2) constituency orientation, i.e., get things for your constituency
- 3) style is bargaining and trading; a distributive style - you help me I help you, you hit me I hit you, it's piecemeal, incremental style, it's an insider style. That's why the press stuff comes hard for him. It's an age and a style problem. He stayed so long in the House, he found it hard to change his style. A big contrast to Quayle. More like Specter than Quayle in terms of past experience.

Tim talked too about Mark's long time trouble with the Republican party as one of the things that made the soil fertile for the Conrad seed. I kept putting it that way. What was there about the soil? If you put it that way, the farm issue is very important. Absent any farm issue, Conrad's negative ads would have been most picky.

Tim mentioned Rand and the law suit and said he just didn't know how important they were.