

by the way, didn't analyze Clark

ANDY LOEWI

February 9, 1979

I met Andy for lunch at National Airport and we talked briefly about the campaign.

My first question was "what happened?" and he said "In retrospect, two things: single issue voting on the Panama Canal and abortion--especially the single issue voting of the pro-lifers--and low turnout."

Would you have done anything different? "Nothing. It was out of our hands. Working with the information we had at the time, there was nothing else we could have done that we didn't do. If I had it to do over again, I would do it the same way--knowing what I knew at the time."

"We knew the pro-lifers were there, but we thought we had an elaborate strategy for dealing with them. During the last week of the campaign we ran a full page ad in all the Catholic newspapers. We handed out leaflets in every Catholic Church in the 30 most Catholic counties the Sunday before election. We covered every mass in every church. We thought that would give us a cushion. But it wasn't there."

"What did the leaflet say?" "On the front it asked the voters to compare Jepsen and Clark on all the issues. I don't remember the exact copy, but it was the standard thing we were saying in all our literature. And on the back it said the following Iowa Catholics are supporting Dick Clark and in small print we listed name after name after name."

I asked him if this was a major part of their overall strategic plan. "No, we carried on our regular campaign and did the abortion thing on top of it. We had such a well financed campaign that we could do everything else, the

television, the radio, the newspapers and still had plenty of money to implement the abortion strategy. We had the money to do anything we wanted to do. We had the organization to do anything we wanted to do. We did everything we thought we had to do. But it just wasn't enough."

If you know what you know now, would you conduct the campaign differently? "I'd do two things differently. First, I would attack Jepsen, smear him. I think the only kind of campaign that will succeed today is a negative campaign. People don't believe anything positive about any politician, because they are against all politicians. Oh, we attacked Jepsen a little bit, but not much-- not nearly enough. It wasn't a major theme. Second, I would face up to the pro-lifers directly and show them as people who were persecuting Dick Clark, who were "out to get" Dick Clark. I would paint them as radicals. The campaign would border on being anti Catholic. It would try to make people see the pro-lifers as very unfair to Dick and thus generate sympathy for him. Overall I would raise the emotional level of the campaign, and give our supporters a reason to go out and vote. It was our supporters who didn't turn out. They thought everything was going so well they didn't have to. After all the press told them it was all over. And then there were those people who were mad at Dick for one reason or another and voted against him, never dreaming he would lose. A more emotional kind of campaign might have kept them from voting for Jepsen, whom they never would have voted for except as a protest."

Could you have gotten Dick Clark to run such a campaign? "I don't know. It would have been hard. We ran an unemotional, positive kind of campaign, because that's the kind of guy Dick Clark is."

"We were so god damned confident. Election day was beautiful, the nicest November day you can have in Iowa, and when we saw that, we knew we were going

to win. That settled it. It was in the bag. The first bad news we heard was in the early afternoon when the Des Moines Register poll of people as they came out of the voting booth showed Jepsen 56, Clark 44. That was a one o'clock poll; and was phoned in by a friendly reporter. We didn't put any stock in it figuring it was a bad sample. We just didn't believe it. Then, when their 4:00 poll came in, it showed Jepsen 53%, Clark 47%, so we began to breathe easier. Then around 9:00 just before the polls closed we learned that the Register had scrapped the whole thing because they felt the sample was all screwed up. "Well, that clinches it," we said. And we were as happy as we could be. Twenty five minutes later, ABC called Jepsen the winner."

"Why would you do anything differently when the polls tell you you are 30 points ahead. That's what Peter Hart told us from interviews conducted October 4-6. There were two polls. The other was the Des Moines Register poll which never changed from May till the week before election. Four days before the election we were ahead in their poll 50.8 to 39.2. You can't believe what those polls tell you. If there's any one thing I've taken away from this campaign it is that anybody who believes those polls is out of his cotton picking mind."

"For one thing they can't predict turnout. The Des Moines Register poll asked people "Are you certain you are going to vote?" And they concluded, on the basis of other answers they got that the turnout would be 54% instead of the 44% we did get. And they were our supporters that didn't vote."

"It wasn't an organizational problem. We had the best election day effort you could have. We put a tremendous amount of resources into the election day. We had _____ thousand volunteers knocking on doors in Linn County--more than ever in the history of the county. That's Dick's home county. And we lost

it. The volunteers knocked on the doors and the people said "I'm not going to vote." It was a great organizational effort."

Then he talked about TV. "Jepsen wasn't on TV during the last three weeks. And we had the greatest media buy. I think we spent 300,000 on television. We spent much more on TV than he did. We spent more money on the campaign altogether than anybody had ever spent before in Iowa. Dick always said that the one way we could be blown out of the water was by a massive TV campaign against us. There was none of that--another reason for being confident. Jepsen spent a lot of money. Actually he outspent us. But he spent it on direct mail with Richard Vigurie--not a cost effective way to spend money. You don't know, though, how effective those things are."

I raised the question of getting out of touch over the six year term because you don't have to run his first reply was: "He never got out of touch, because he was home so much. He was home every year as much as most Senators are only the year they run for reelection. If the reason for wanting to stay in touch is to find out what the voters think about something so you can go back and vote that way, it doesn't apply to Dick. His voting record would never change no matter what he heard at home. I noticed that after the election his conservative coalition score came out; it was just the same as it had been every other year."

I said, then, that I didn't necessarily mean getting out of touch in that sense, but that he might not be as attuned to what was necessary by way of campaigning. I think it was here that he broke in and exclaimed that they were 30 points ahead in the polls. The answer was not satisfactory and we didn't really address it. Part of what he said had to do, though, with Dick behaving in his natural manner.

Later he said "With respect to your book and the 6 year thing, I don't think Dick fits the mold. He played the incumbency thing to the hilt."

Well he did, but if they can now conceive of a campaign that might have done better--admittedly in retrospect--isn't it possible to argue that he "should" have seen that or "could" have if he had been regularly testing the mood of the voters? Because part of Andy's argument is, in part, that they misread the mood--the negative mood--of the voters.

"I don't think it possible to run a campaign "for" anything today. You have to be against--especially a liberal. Who is going to run a campaign by being "for" national health insurance? Not today. Maybe it will change in time. Now you have to attack and be negative. He returned to this theme several times. And the question is whether or not that might have been observable.

But it would have been so totally out of character for him to do that that one can hardly imagine Clark doing it. When I repeated my understanding of what Dick was doing when I was there, i.e., that he was answering the abortion question by saying that people would judge him on all the issues and that they would judge on integrity, character etc., he said: "That's what we thought. That's what all the national columnists were telling us. That's what all the Iowa writers were telling us. That's what the polls were telling us." The implication was: 'Why in the world would anyone change?' And I guess I'd have to agree. Clark would have had to have an extraordinary political senses to have believed anything else.

When I asked whether there had been any fingerprinting after the election he said something to the effect that some people had better hindsight than foresight, but that no one was claiming they saw what was coming. The only

thing he did sort of indicate might have been the subject of some second guessing was their TV ads. He said something to the effect that they weren't superb ads. *By some way!*

He said Dick's job approval after the election was 60%--as high as it had been before the election.

Ended by saying "It was the hardest way to learn. It was a bitter pill."

Ended by talking about John Culver. "Culver has to worry about the same problems we had. He's crazy if he thinks the abortion thing will go away. I think Dick's defeat has made a big difference for him. It means he'll run again. Before the election he wasn't sure. I think that if Dick had won, Culver would not have run. He could have felt that there was someone left behind who cared about the things he did. But now--he sees everything in macho terms, like a big football game--he says "We can't just walk off the field now, can we? Huh? Huh?" *as Culver* He's the opposite of Dick. He never goes back to Iowa, is never in the papers. He doesn't give a shit. He ran five times for the House and he's tired of going back to the district all the time. He stays in Washington. So it will be interesting to see what happens. His supporter is deeper than Dick's in some places. After all, some of his supporters have been with him for 15 years. But his support isn't as wide. He's such an irascible son of a bitch that fewer people like him than liked Dick. But he can generate more emotional support than Dick. Dick's loss will help him--because the Iowa Democrats are on notice. He knows what has to be done and he's a great campaigner. He's mean--a very competitive guy. It will be a very close race, but I think he can win."

Then he went on to say that for Iowans, the Democratic surge is fading Berkely Bedell is in some kind of tax trouble. "Maybe pretty soon Iowa

Democrats will be right back where they were when it all started--with one congressman--Neal Smith."

I asked if bringing Kennedy to Dubuque was, on balance, a good move. He said the problem was that TK got behind, they had to cancel the rally in town and have it at the airport. The airport is 20 minutes from town, so that only the most intrepid supporters came. He said that the supporters made up 2/3 of the crowd and the anti Clark people made up one-third. But the crowd was so small--maybe 100 or so--that the hecklers were magnified. Still, he said their polls showed Kennedy very popular with Iowa Catholics. He also said that he, personally, thought it would help Clark to see the rabid proliferators out there heckling him. He says he and Clark disagree on that. Clark is just not sure. He thinks that the anti-abortionists have not tapped their full potential and that the more attention they get, the stronger they will become. Andy is now sure that you need to hit them head on, i.e., activate the "persecution-sympathy syndrome." He says DC just not convinced yet.