

Bill Frenzel

February 14-16, 1976

Saturday - 14th

7:45	Breakfast at Sheraton Ritz with Bill and Doug Platt <i>Bro</i>
9:00	Guthrie Theatre picture taking
10:00	Office - Federal Building
12:00	Fifth District Republican Women's Club ✓
2:00	Minnesota Soy Bean Growers Association ✓
4:00	Meeting at Office with Free Children of Viet Nam Group

Sunday - 15th

9:00	Knesseth Israel Synagogue - St. Louis Park ✓
11:00	Lincoln Dell
12:00	St. Louis Park Bnai Brith Lodge (at Hopkins House Motel) ✓
1:30	Sue and Al Zelitson
3:00	Art Larsen Cocktail Party
7:30	Volunteer Committee Meeting

Monday - 16th

9:00	Sears Roebuck - Minnetonka ✓
10:00	Lemandts to buy suit
11:30	McQuay - Perfitz Co., Plymouth ✓ ✓
1:15	AAUW - Minneapolis
2:30	State Legislators - Capitol - St. Paul ✓

Bill Frenzel

We agreed to meet for breakfast at my hotel - Sheraton Ritz--and 10 minutes early he called my room and said "Reveille!"

H, Brad Platt and I spent day together--Brad is one of the "Volunteer Committee," sells advertising for a farm magazine, I think works for Meredith Company.

After breakfast we went to the Guthrie Theatre for picture taking--for the campaign. He talked about the religious makeup of the district--sparked by the cathedral across the street. "A plurality is Lutheran, next is Catholic--no, maybe Catholic is the largest single denomination, but the protestants outnumber them overall. The Anglicans are quite active. The Jews make up maybe 3-5%, but they all vote. The Episcopalians are afffluent and Republican. The Lutherans are personally very conservative and they are mostly Republican. The Catholics--well, the Irish are Democrats. And the Jews will vote Republican--not at the national level, but at the congressional level they will--especially the younger ones. A lot of Jews under 40 are Republican."

At breakfast he talked about the closing of a naval base here in Minneapolis and how he was in favor of closing it. "It was a luxury we couldn't afford, the only purpose of which was to help people get their pensions. But I did my duty and led my group down to testify. "Don't close down the air base" I said, "wink wink." "It's very important to our economy, wink, wink." "It was a totally unnecessary waste of money."

Last night they had had a party for all the people that worked in their campaign. "That's how we keep in touch." It was a Dutch treat open

bar and they were pleased with the turnout. He was making the point that this was one of the things they had to get out of the way.

no ed concern - finding people
"We have to take care of the Republicans--pat them on the head and make love to them--now and get them out of the way before summer. It's a waste of time to sell the Republicans. They're already sold. If they're not, they'll still vote for me. They don't have any choice. If you let them they'll take all your time. 'Oh, there are some people you've just got to meet.' When you go there, they are the same 10 people you always see. We don't use the campaign to sell Republicans."

From Guthrie, we went to his downtown office, met Marc Olson, where we had some slack time ("I wish we had more to do.") and I got in some questions. Then Willy Brandt, a postman, came in with his envelope of newspaper articles, cartoons, timesheets, etc. for Bill to see. He comes regularly to see Bill and tell him his ideas on things--monsly how ineptly the post office is run. Then we went to lunch, ^{Brad}~~Doug~~, Marc Olson, Bill and I to a place that had tubs of peanuts on every table.

The interesting talk there was about his "volunteer committee" which he had referred to a lot in answering my questions. He called them "the care group" or just "the group" and said they were about 9 or 10 and they were his closest associates. He wouldn't pin the number down too tight. "It's a movable feast." I gave him several options as to how to describe them and he said they weren't the most powerful, not representative, and when I said they were advisers, that they would give him emotional lift and that they were his best workers--when I gave him those additional options, he said, "You're getting warm."

"We're a group of people who have the same philosophy of government-- we are philosophical soul mates. We all believe that people should be involved in their government. We've all been in politics and all came to the group through the Republican party. And then there is an emotional grab. We all like each other."

I asked if he met with them regularly and he said no but that they saw each other a lot and would tomorrow night.

"I never call them together to ask them how I should vote. I may surprise them sometimes, but they tolerate my aberrations."

I asked if he ever got them together to ask them 'what should I do' and he said yes that there was one occasion when he did just that--with an expanded group of 15. It was the time he filed his income tax late. "I had to decide whether I should kill myself, resign from office, not run again the next time, stay and fight it out, or what. So I called the core group together--slightly expanded maybe to 15--and we discussed it. That was a classic example of consultation--at a turning point in my career."

Marc said that it had been dramatic because the meeting was called and no one knew why it had been called.

Marc distinguished 3 rings of people in the campaign: 9 or 10 of the "volunteer committee" who are involved all the time, which expands to about 30--who run the campaign and then to about 150 who do the work during the campaign.

Bill said that about half of the current volunteer committee had been with him since the beginning--that there is some turnover, but that it's a pretty stable group. They mentioned Nielson, Butler? or Grant?, Iris, Doug, Marc, Sid Larsen (where I'm going tomorrow).

After lunch, we went to Fifth District Republican Women's Lunch; we drove to the Sheraton to the Soy Bean group, by way of the clothing store

As we got to the Sheraton, I asked him about the size of rock bottom Democratic strength.

"Any Democrat will get 40%. I got 63.8% in 1972, but that was because of McGovern who was thought to be a bad candidate. Last time I got 60% and I think that's all there is for me in this district. The extra 3.8% was a phony figure. When I got 60% I ran ten miles ahead of every other Republican candidate in the district. I led Nixon in 1972. If things are right I should get 60% next time, too. Maybe less. If Humphrey runs for president, every Democrat will turn out. And the *W* factor could hurt. Republicans do better in biennial years when the vote is down, then we do in quadrennial years when the vote goes up. Republicans also do better at lower levels of office--we elect city councilmen easier than state legislators, state legislator easier than congressman, congressman easier than governor, governor easier than senator."

I asked him who the Democrats were. "The same kinds of people who surface as Republicans--businessmen, college professors, teachers--lots of teachers among the Democrats, some limousine liberals, some labor, people in Richfield and Robbinsdale, whose area is like a decaying central city, and senior citizens who've voted democratic all their life and still do, but have forgotten why, some Jews, but the Jewish vote can be had."

"Organized labor is not strong in the district. The typical blue collar worker here is a relatively well off, a teamster who owns a truck, someone in the building trade. They make between \$15,000 and \$25,000 a year and they vote very independently."

He said he saw no candidate to oppose him - said labor would like to, that they were especially mad at him for his *situs* picketing vote "and a lot of other things" but that he thought they would not try to go after him.

When I asked him if he had a primary opponent. "It's not the style here to run in a primary. We have district conventions and whoever gets the endorsement runs. I once had a primary opponent. He didn't mean any harm. He just wanted to run for Congress. I never saw him."

On the way to the men's clothing store, Brad tried to get Bill to run for the Senate. I can't remember anything noteworthy in terms of quotations, but the general gist was:

- (1) BF clearly has thought about going statewide in some race.
- (2) He thinks Republicans have easier time getting to be governor than Senator.
- (3) But those who succeeded as governor had something to start with--their association with certain activities. "Anderson rode in on his mental health activities, LeVander as the basis of all his associations and memberships. I don't have anything. I can't get a handle on it."
- (4) They talked more about Mondale--whom Brad dislikes intensely and Bill agrees is "in the abstract, beatable." They talked about how certain Republicans had done pretty well even without a campaign. Yet Bill chastened by fact McGregor "who was a great campaigner" couldn't carry own district by more than 40% vs. HH.
- (5) Bill thinks that taking spending limits off would help him in a Senate race - limits still operate in governor's race. We talked some about the media and he said you could run a media campaign in Minnesota--that 2 TV stations and one radio station pretty well blanket the state

except for "pockets" you might reach from Sioux Falls, Fargo and Duluth. But it's one media market pretty much.

(6) He can't project what's going to happen in future. "In 1960, a dunce could predict the next decade. But now I can't extrapolate from one year to the next. More voters are becoming independent; but the trend toward independence is slower here than elsewhere and the number of apathetic voters is large. I just can't read it." There's great hesitation to commit himself when it all seems so uncertain. Clearly, he's rolling it over and over. Sometimes Brad would say "If we run statewide ..." and sometimes "when we run statewide..."

I don't know how much he's getting around. He expressed himself as puzzled by voting habits of farmers. "Those 7th District farmers are so conservative when they walk their shoes squeak. But they vote Democratic. I just don't understand them."

"If you move one inch off the norm in a small town you're dead. When I was given that rural area in North Hennepin, I went up there in my mother's Cadillac to campaign. I wasn't getting anywhere until someone was nice enough to come over and whisper to me. The next time I went up there in a small car and I went like gang busters. "You're doing just fine now" they'd say. "Good work sonny." Said how his dad had a company car and mother a cadillac and he had to drive latter when he came home and how he hated to do it.

He called the Soy Bean Growers group "apathetic remnant" a very small group--since most all farmers grow some soy beans, but think of themselves as something else. "There are more soy bean farmers at the Wheat Growers meetings than there were here today."

They weren't his constituents, but he was sizing up their strength.

At the meeting he spoke briefly about their concern with palm oil competing vs. soy bean oil and about some suggestion that government market all the grain. And he ran against Congress. "I can't imagine the government as the only seller of grain. I have a hard time thinking of the government doing anything well. I've seen local government make mistakes. But that's minor league compared to the mistakes we make in Washington. There has got to be a better way. Assassinate the Congress or something. (Applause)

After the Soy Bean meeting we returned to the office to a meeting with 8 members of the "Free Children of Viet Name"--who have adopted--or are trying to adopt Viet Nam children and are afraid they will lose them. Bill promised to write a letter or call INS to ask 'em to speed up the adoption process, despite court challenge by some group. Said they'd keep in touch. They seemed to think well of Bill's staff and he told them how his brother adopted a Korean.

His answer to question #1 on questionnaire, i.e., plans re his constituency.

"I had observed my predecessor's operation. My campaign committee and I decided it would be worthwhile having an office in the district. The one my predecessor had was in the city outside the district. One of the vulgar promises I made, therefore, was that I would have an office in the Third District. That was the only perception I had. I knew only that my family would be in Washington. I had been in the state legislature, but there you are completely insulated. I had zero recognition; and nobody called me. When I got to Washington I was thunderstruck at the number of

constituent requests we received. So I decided I could not abandon the downtown office. The Watts line was there and people were used to coming here. From talking to the McGregor people and the Mondale people, I decided this was a key location and that I could do a lot of case work from this building. So, if I had a district office, it would be a satellite office of this one. This one is the principal office, the nerve center.

I intended to have one person in each office. Both people I chose were people I had known in politics, people who worked for me in the campaign. One had worked for a car rental service and was used to talking about problems on the telephone. I put her here. The other was more used to detail and I put her in the satellite office where she had more time. The only thing I had to look at was my predecessor's office. He said that all his people wanted to stay with me. My campaign committee and I decided it would be unwise to ^{hire them} ~~hire them~~. I wanted to put my stamp on the office and these people would be identified with him. When people were helped, they would still think my predecessor was helping them. There was a very good person in this office. She wanted to stay, but I didn't keep her. It was a hard decision, but it was the right decision.

In Washington, I did take two of his people. After counselling with my committee, we decided that everyone being hired would be from the district--not necessarily within the boundaries, but close by--people who knew the people and knew the character of the district. I started with 3 of McGregor's people all of whom knew the district. Around that nucleus, I built a staff. All the staff--at home and Washington were in their 20's. They were experienced, they had been through my campaigns; they knew who my friends

were; they knew who the mayors were; they had all had political experience--some more than I had. I have encouraged them to stay awhile and move on to make a career of it; so there has been a lot of turnover on the staff.

"On communicating with the constituency, I wasn't quite sure. I did not perceive the enormous proportion of total resources that would go into communication and case work. I thought I would ride to the seat of government and make laws. But I saw that it took less of my time than grievance handling and communication. Besides I had pressure from 3 sides to come home. First, my volunteer committee was anxious to have me seen at home; and they would find any excuse they could to pressure me to come home. Second, a lot of my constituents wanted to see me. The other pressure came from my own inexperience or lack of confidence--which is still a pressure which brings me home. This is my political base. Washington is not my political base. I feel I have to come home to get nourished, to see for myself what's going on. It's my security blanket, coming home. I came home 40 times the first year. I'm not sure I did it right. I did more rotary clubs than real work. I had to feel my way."

"I have changed my staff but they are still from the district. We lose experience, but we gain enthusiasm. It is a tradeoff and we think it is a profitable tradeoff. No matter who comes to our office, there's someone who comes from their town or from their area. Constituents get the same warm feeling that I get from coming home."

Answer to question #2. "It is a wholly suburban district made up of mature suburbs. It is well-educated, affluent, white. Although it tends to be Republican, it has a suburban streak of liberalism running through it. It's different from the one I used to have, which had rural and urban pockets.

It's very homogeneous. It's all first, second or third ring suburbs. There are only two communities with any room for development left. (Then a pause) Vocationally, it's a business executive or a professional man. I'm ~~too~~^{thin} in on blue collar. The district is not heavily influenced by blue collar. It tends to be young and--like the Congressman--growing older. It has a heavy proportion of double wage earners--which accounts for a lot of the high income statistics."

Answer to question #11. (Re issue awareness) "Minnesota is an issue-oriented place and the district is extremely issue-oriented, particularly compared with some of my colleagues. I annually query my constituents and they are pretty good about answering. The letters I get don't say yes or no. They show more concern for what should be done. They say, if you would do this and so, it would lead to such and such happening and things could be better."

"The district is shot full of community groups. The LWV is important to me because of their interest in issues and they are strong throughout this district. There are a lot of clubs in each community and there's an overlay of clubs from the city that cover the metropolitan area. It's an active place."

Answer to question #18. "I think I have the image of being independent. There aren't many people who don't know I'm a republican. But as my polls say and as my friends say and as I feel it, I'm thought to be independent and outspoken. When people ask me what I think on an issue, I tell them. I think that was true, too, of my predecessor."

That led me to ask him whether he thought he imposed style on district or district on him. "It works both ways. It's a crummy congressman who lets

*16/14/76
from
style (m)
quoting
the way*

his district impose its will on him. A congressman who comes from a homogeneous district like mine will vote the way his district wants most of the time because he's so much like them. Sometimes, my colleagues vote to give a cookie to their district just because they think the district wants something. That's wrong. Because of the size and the intimacy of our districts, we have an opportunity to provide leadership that Senators don't have. They can only read polls. But I can go see my editors and mayors and the League of Women Voters and can turn them--maybe not turn them, but start them out in the right direction. Anyone who doesn't take advantage of the opportunity to lead is wrong. The hard thing is when you have to come back and apologize for something you did. You can go and explain and while you may not make them love you, you can make them hate you less. There's a great opportunity for leadership. You accidentally vote with the district enough so you ought to look for the opportunity to exert leadership."

I asked for example and he mentioned revenue sharing which he won support for--in face of some skepticism--by explaining.

Also Viet Nam. "When I first ran, the district was supportive of our participation in Viet Nam. I thought we should be getting out--have a time around, certain. I'm not sure I turned the district ~~and~~, but I could go back and talk to people about it. I did some good."

"The extreme case was the prayer amendment. My constituents polled 90% in favor. I was able to come back and explain that it wouldn't do what they thought it would do and might do what they didn't want it to do. I got some ministers to organize meetings. That was not leadership; it was a self defense mechanism. Some women even put up billboards asking why I was

against prayer." (Said earlier he thought the bill board backfired as it seemed like special interest pleading.)

What do people know about your voting record? "I don't think people could specify anything of my voting record in general. The Minneapolis paper publishes the voting record each week on the big issues if anyone wishes to follow it. People have an idea of what I am like that comes from the press instead of knowledge that comes from scanning my voting record. Or from hearing me talk about it--whether I'm for or against Viet Nam or big spending. What they know is based more on what I say than my voting record. I have a lot of trouble interpreting my votes to my constituents. I once printed it and offered to send it to anyone who wanted it. No one did. It was too complicated to understand. Now I tell people they can go to my district office to see how I voted. But I tell them to budget a lot of time so that my staff can explain it to them. It's very complicated."

Interview of King
of suburbs
incorporates
change

Today I had a glimpse of an idea that might help explain Bill. He seems to take change in stride. I can't say where this idea comes from except that I got it when he commented on a hippie type kid. He said it with a kind of acceptance and without any bite and it seemed to fit. I'll keep an eye open; but there doesn't seem to be any longing for a simpler age in Bill or berating of the young. Maybe it's related to his independence. He hires all young people--that's a clue, too.

In talking to Soy Bean group, Bill started by saying that nothing more than geraniums were grown in his district. He linked his Trade Subcommittee to their concern for palm oil and made one statement that U.S. supported palm industry in Malaysia shouldn't sell their stuff here in competition with our farmers. That got big applause--it was what they wanted to hear. He was not

a real farmer like Hagedorn who preceded or Quie who succeeded him. BF is more glib and, occasionally, used inappropriate language, I thought; when he told them that their statement was "terribly well done" they laughed. He had meant it as a compliment and the word juxtaposition--which would have been perfectly understood in the suburbs--did not go over with farmers. Also when one farmer asked him if he had ever thought that farmers were subsidizing the consumers, he said, No, he hadn't and he'd like to learn. His basic posture was one of learning--and they appreciated his coming.

At Volunteer meeting. "I've been giving some thought to the campaign theme. What people want in their public officials today is independence. We can't be so vulgar as to use the word 'independence' in our literature. But we have to differentiate me from the rest of those bandits down there in Congress. 'They are awful, but our guy is wonderful.' That's the message we have to get across."

Re working with the Republican party during the campaign. "We never have worked with the party in any way, shape, or manner."

Re synagogue meeting. "That meeting was a ten strike. I was exposed to a group of people that I had never met before. They were smart, thoughtful, up on things, knew what they wanted done, had certain things they were interested in. It was especially good afterward when several came up and had specific information they wanted to get from me. I was particularly glad to meet the Rabbi. He's very active and I had heard of him but had never met him. You can't accomplish anything in politics in this district except by one on one. So I was happy to have the chance to sit with him, eat breakfast with him and get to know him. I think we may have something going now. That was a real score." *The importance of people coming up afterward w/ before speeches.*

"It has been very hard for me to break into the Jewish Community--especially since I'm a Republican. It's hard for them to support Republicans since they are considered the private presence of Hubert Humphrey. They think he opened up Minneapolis to the Jews when he was mayor and they are intensely loyal to him. I don't know what he did, but he must have done something good to gain that loyalty."

"The Bnai Brith group was a waste of time--a washout. Nothing happened between us--no communication. I couldn't fit them into the community at all. They weren't interested; they had no questions; no one came up to me before the meeting or afterwards. There didn't seem to be anything they wanted from me, so they will be of no help politically. It was hard for me to get interested in my speech and it was like a sleeping pill for both of us. Finally as we left, one guy came racing in my direction and I thought that finally someone was going to ask me a question. But he was on his way to the Men's Room! Incidents like that are humbling--they help you from feeling too self-important."

The point is that there was a day-night contrast between the two meetings with the Jewish groups.

After his AAUW speech on taxes I asked him if his W & M membership had made a difference. "It's been better for me in Washington, but it's been even better for me back home. It's one reason the press takes me seriously now. When they write about me they call me a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee or the prestigious Ways and Means Committee. I've been on local television 3 times as much in the one year I've been on Ways and Means as I was in the whole four previous years--and not just on taxes, on all subjects. Now they treat me as if I'm a real guy."

"Another thing it has done to me...when I came to Washington I had the reputation of being a big liberal. But gradually, through my work on the election commission and my opposition to post card registration, I gradually rehabilitated myself in the eyes of my Republican colleagues. Now, on Ways and Means, I stick out like a sore thumb! So four years of rehabilitation has gone by the wayside."

Re his previous feeling of being bored. "It's more interesting. Now I have another mountain to climb. If there's another plateau, then I'll reach it later than I would have. I was getting pretty bored on Banking and Currency. Perhaps it would have been different this year with a different chairman. Bill Steiger and I were talking about it. We feel like freshmen again. It makes you wonder which act will follow. I guess the next act would be the Budget Committee." Despite the fact that he's in the minority, he's happier than before because he has a better committee.

"The subject I like the best is trade. On Banking and Currency I was on two subcommittees, each of which touched on the subject. On the Trade Subcommittee, I'm on the first team on trade. It's my hobby."

I asked him who else had a district like his. "Everyone is different of course. But I suppose Jim Symington's would be like mine. He has the Western suburbs of St. Louis. I think of my district as a typical suburban district; but yet it's not like the bedroom suburbs of New York City or Chicago. I don't know what Seattle is like. I've never thought of it much." Then the next day he continued. "You asked me whose district was like mine. Perhaps Pat Schroeder's district in Denver. Or maybe Joel Pritchard's in Seattle." And when I asked him about bedroom idea, he said, "People who

live in the first ring of suburbs usually work in the community. And even those who live further out and commute don't think of their communities as just places to sleep. They have a real feeling for their community."

open change
"There is about a 30% turnover in bodies every year; but the type of bodies remains the same. My guess is that 30% is probably too high--because housing has declined and the district is more developed. It used to be a game of musical houses."

On the way out Monday a.m., he asked if I had read the morning paper and I said that HHH job bill was headline. "We can't compete with their rhetoric. And we can't touch the hearts of the constituents the way they do. We can't offer Utopia, Camelot and a chicken in every pot. You would think the electorate would wake up one day and decide to vote for what's good for the country. But it never happens."

"Competing with Humbert Humphrey is a lesson in humility. I remember once when I gave a speech that was very warmly received. Afterward the group gave me a plaque. Then they gave Ruthie a plaque just for being associated with me--and everyone clapped for her. Then the door opened and Hubert walked in. They tore the building down and all of a sudden I was standing in a corner. It's just like high school when all the boys are chasing the same girl for a date--some guys have it and some guys don't."

Frenzel reminds me most of Wiggins in the phone in meetings people.
Re Sears Roebuck. "This is a new adventure for us. These people are really unsophisticated. They don't track well. They can't get their questions out. It's neat, because it lets me get exposure to people I wouldn't have contact with otherwise. If they meet the congressmen, they might find he's not so scary and they might ask me for something."

Often he discussed meetings as if the goal was to get people in a posture to ask him for something. At one point he said "Sometimes I check

in the office to see how far behind we are in answering the mail. We turn out a lot of mail; but when you think of what a small percentage of the people in the district actually write to us, it's real scary."

Also, walking into Sears, he said, "You like to make contact with people where they live, work, pray and play. It's hardest to find them where they work. But it's a good place. It's their turf. They feel comfortable. They are together. It's hard for people when you meet them individually. When you say hello in a shopping center, they want to hurry right on by. You sticka out your hand and say 'Hi, I'm Bill Frenzel. Do you have any problems?' Of course they have problems. They want to get the hell out of there."

After the two Monday AM meetings, I asked him to rate them with the synagogue meeting--which was the best of yesterday. He rated both of them ahead of the synagogue meeting.

Re synagogue--"They were earnest and well informed, though I didn't know many of them, they all knew me. They knew who I was. So while it was good, I didn't meet as many new people as I did at either place today."

"The kind of meetings I like are those that give me a chance to mingle briefly instead of orate." *A open, the one on one like Fly nt, but different.*

Re McQuay-Perfitz where he had lunch and handshaking in the cafeteria after we met with the executive of the company. Re cafeteria. "It was a excellent. Those were people who didn't know me, who had never met me. There was a child-like quality about meeting the Congressman. It was a real event for them. And they were surprisingly talkative. It was an ice-breaker. That's the best kind of meeting."

Re Sears Roebuck. "It was good, but not quite as good as the other. It was more formal with me up there behind a podium lecturing. But they were new people. And I got a chance to move around a little before it began."

At the AAUW. "Congress has a 20% approval rating. That's 2 points better than 'don't know' and three points worse than sugar rationing in wartime."

Not once on trip was he asked to explain a vote.

AAUW chairwoman started by saying he had 100% voting record with them. He said afterward "That group had a strongly geriatric flavor to it."

When he was asked at McQuay-Perfitz how things were in Congress, "Things in Congress are about usual,--no, they are better than usual because we are in recess."

I asked him which part of the McQ-P meeting was best with company executives or employees in the cafeteria. "Talking with the executives is what you have to do to get in to meet the employees. It's the price you pay to get to the people--a command performance." That isn't Wiggins' attitude--he likes to meet with the executives. BF says he does this "about 15-20 times a year"--less, I would guess than CW.

He went over his list of events--from before I got there and commented on them. Constant theme was that big meetings--his own big party and the Charity Ball--were good--he called his party "a smashing success. I got to mingle with people I knew and talk to people who had problems." Other events (the women's Republican group "a big nothing") were judged by whether or not he was speakin to converts - he spoke to Edina Chamber of Commerce. "It was

a duty--talking to a bunch of people who know me and are going to vote for me anyway." That complaint runs through his commentary--he wants to meet new people, "real people," and that's a measure of success.


He said his finances breakfast "was exhilarating to me because we were organizing." The volunteer meeting was like that, too. That is, meetings of hard core or primary constituency that have to do with the campaign organization are good meetings. But that's a matter of talking to people you know who are committed workers.

Another piece in puzzle is his admiration for people who organize, have a lot of zip--like Joan Caldwell--who help out in community activities --charity stuff especially--"She's a super gal. She organized the charity ball." "She did a super job for the Junior League." He has special affection for LWV. "They are democrats. I meet with them quarterly, tell them what's gone on--for about 10 minutes. They ask questions that are designed to test me. That's good for me." They seem to represent his leftward flank. (Maybe Ripon, too,--he talks about Ripon more than anyone I know.) And he wants to keep it protected. But I think his appreciation of the LWV style is also important in some way. He's attuned to women's issues, was "right" in all the AAUW "feminism" issues, and kept telling people whenever EEOC came up that women's rights were where the future crunch would be rather than blacks. So woman power is important to him--organizationally, stylistically and ideologically.

He is personally conservative--in dress and in spending money for personal things.

He said that his pollster in 1974 said he had 44% name recognition and that 44% was just on the national average.

It's a commentary on the compactness of the district that the committee feels they need only 3 billboards to capture just about everyone. They had some discussion about 2 or 4. They said/they only had 2 that ^{if} they wouldn't know which one to cut and if they had 4 they wouldn't know where to put it. So 3 is the magic number and that's what they will have. But 3 outside billboards would never capture all the traffic patterns in BC's district. So it is compact.

Sunday night, on the way from "My  " after supper he spoke of the different parts of the district he had been in since he had been home - North, South, West, etc. and he said, "We all try to do that, to spread ourselves around geographically. If people see that you are in the same place two or three times in a short p/eriod, they feel they are being ignored." He started this discussion by talking about BC's pins.

"Politics in Minnesota is different. We have wrestled with the problem of independence in politics. We have a tradition of local non-partisan elections. And we have a tradition of people of one party endorsing someone of the other party. It began when the Non Partisan Leauge came over from North Dakota in the 1920's and gave a tone ^{to} ~~on~~ Minnesota politics that has lasted to this day." He talks a lot about independence, sees himself that way, getting Democratic votes. Republican Party of Minnesota now calls itself the "Independent Republican" party.

Re his pulling power - there was a discussion at the strategy meeting ^{other} about putting/Republican candidates' names on his billboards. "They don't help me, but I sure as hell help them."

His newsletter list = 27,000; he gets 15,000 back from his question-naire--which he sends and they send back on a post card.

He introduces me as "my friend" or a "Professor Dick Fenno from the University of Rochester in New York." And to his "volunteer committee" he said "he claims to be an author, but his sales don't warrant the title."

A methodological point that could be made is that in the capitol hill interview you get the person's undivided attention--however short the time. It's one on one. In the field it's rarely one on one. This trip, I did not see him as much as before, alone. Brad, Debbie and Marc drove him. And they all have important claims on his time. Also a lot of time is sometimes consumed by the congressman preparing for the next event--reading notes, reading material sent to him by the group, etc. But these guys, for the most part, can talk easily and crank up on the spot.

He's familiar with the business leaders of the area - *as we* passed various industries, he would comment on who runs them.

In speech to synagogue he was talking about Arab countries making arms deals for cash, buying from whomever would sell them. "The only place where they make more deals is the Congress" (laughter).

"Sunday is often my Jewish Day. A lot of the men's clubs hold their meetings that day. And there's not much else you can do on Sunday."

He talked about St. Louis Park - "It used to be called Tel Aviv Central or St. Jewish Park, because all the Jews moved out from North Minneapolis and settled there. That's changed now. I'd guess about 25% is Jewish now--and maybe that's high. The Jews are important in the community because of their leadership and their wealth, not because of their numbers."

He was asked at B'nai Brith: re post office. "Isn't there any sanity up there on the Hill? "Not much. No, let me phrase it positively; there is some sanity on the Hill." (laughter)

"Running for office in a suburban district is impossible. There are no continuous streets anywhere."

"I received a \$1000 contribution from the Minnesota Education Association, after I had insisted we have a meeting so that they understood my position. They supported me because they thought I would win. They were quite frank about it, that they weren't in the business of backing sure losers."

He said he was quite active in terms of mixing in local politics and talked about it at length--in the contest of the meeting he went to deliver his tacit endorsement to Lars Carlson.

"Maybe I should sit above the battle till after the primary, but I do ~~get~~ a great many foolhardy things like this. I'm active in local politics--finding candidates, for example. I send my friends to go see people and talk them into running. If they don't get anywhere, I'll go talk to them myself. A couple of Democratic mayors in my district have endorsed me and I have endorsed them in turn. That may get me in trouble one day, but so far it hasn't. During my first year in Congress I backed someone against the party candidate--and I lost. It was a good lesson for both of us. I learned that I had to be stronger and the party learned it didn't have to roll over when I spoke. We each learned how far we could push the other one. I should have learned my lesson but I'm afraid I haven't."

He said the custom of having mayors and councilmen endorse him was his idea and that he did it in context of the Rice campaign and then just kept doing it, Said that Rice had all the recognition and he had none. So he tried to get the image of a doer, an experienced legislator. Hence, he

got the endorsements from other local officials to help identify himself. At another point he said his recognition % in first poll was 12% and Rice's was 90%. Iris said that in late July 1970, their poll showed Rice at 58% and they didn't tell Bill about it because they thought he'd get discouraged.

*4 names
to me*
There's a lot of spirit in the group and they still tell stories about the "trial by fire" days. At the Volunteer Committee meeting were: Iris Saunderson, LaVonne Samstead, Brad Platt, Mark Rather, Marc Olson, Joan Caldwell, Dave Broden, Bruce Monnick, John Tschoahl, Debbie Frenzel-- Bill and RF. Bill led it, it was good humored consensus building.

It's of interest in terms of personal relationships that Bill never mentioned Nancy till we were leaving each other in the airport. As we parted, he said "Remember me to your wife" and as we got almost out of calling distance, he called to me--walking away--"how's her back?" If we were friends, he would have asked me that question first, or, at least, sometime during our travels. But he thought of it as a "duty" only at the end. The point is we are not friends--even though we like each other and get along well. And that is just the way I want it.

In the tunnel going to the State Capitol he was stopped by two union guys--when he finished talking with them he said "That's the only union that ever supported me--the Communication Workers--because I helped the telephone company get a pay raise from the Cost of Living Council. All the other unions have it in for me. My ^{COPE} ~~Cape~~ rating last year was 9."

The meeting at Iris' took up many campaign items. A budget of \$95,000 was goal--they already had \$27,000 in the bank and John had 50 solicitors working on the rest and said there would be no trouble. Talked about

mailings--which they stress and after discussing which ones to eliminate decided to do all the ones they did before--the big one being "independents and unknowns" which they must hit. Talked about young kids necessary to do the apartments where young people live. No radio and only enough newspaper money to get endorsements. They will spend a good bit on TV and Bruce Monnick handles that--the only discussion there was about the theme. They spent a lot of time going over names of people who could chair each Senatorial district. The production of names and the gossip attendant to the search is a effort for every campaign.

On Ways and Means, he said only 3 that did the total work were Schneebeli, Barber, Steiger and Frenzel. Of Barber, he said "We look to him for leadership." Some of the others were active on special matters--Archer and Clancy, Duncan. But VanderJagt and Crane never come. Of the 3 new ones, he thinks Martin will join the nucleus.

He said he and Mikva were co-sponsoring the bill to revive the Federal Elections Commission before the Supreme Court deadline is up. Said Common Cause asked him and he told them to get him a co-sponsor, and they said Mikva and he was delighted. Said all the Democrats on the House Admin. Committee were too afraid of Wayne Hays to co-sponsor a bill put forth by Common Cause. BF, obviously, works closely with them.