

JOHN GLENN

November 19, 1980

Are you going to be doing some more public speaking?

"Given the huge election margin I received and given the fact that I was one of the few Senators--especially from a large state--who went against the landslide, I decided that I ought to get out and speak on the things I thought were important and criticize the administration in the areas I thought it needed criticizing. And because I refused to make a Shermanesque statement about the Presidency, the press chose to interpret it as a signal that I was starting a move for the presidency. In any job I've ever had, I have never precluded any advancement or any other job it might lead to. So I have refused to make a Shermanesque statement. And I do expect to begin making more speeches. Where that will lead, I have no idea. I do see myself in the center of things somewhere. With Kennedy and Mondale on the left and with Hollings and Scoop on the right, I see myself somewhere in the middle. Exactly where that leaves me I'm not sure. But if you ask me, does this mean I have a big organization in place, geared up to go, the answer is no. I don't know what will happen. In whatever I've ever done I've always thought not about what it would do for me, but about the country. That's the case now. I'm sure the administration will do some good things. But I'm also sure they'll provide plenty of opportunity to criticize what they do. Like everyone else, they'll come ~~on~~^a cropper after about one year." By that time, we had walked down the hall, gotten down the elevator and into the subway car.

For the rest of the ride, he discussed the tendency of Chinese not to kill their leaders - triggered by comparison (by Carl Ford) between what

he was going to do and the trial of the Gang of Four in cages.

When I went in, I met Carl Ford who is JG's staff guy on Foreign Affairs and he started talking about the fact that "inadvertently" a legislative veto ^{got} in a foreign aid bill and some administration people were in the office--since a conference was imminent--trying to get Glenn to help them take it out. He said to me "I've read your books."

When JG came back into the room we reminisced about the Lancaster Fair ("it's gotten pretty seedy") briefly and he remembered how we stopped at the cider place on the way "and bought a pumpkin for Annie").

I asked him if anything happened after I left in the campaign. "Not much. We had a debate before the League of Women Voters, which was a zero. You spend time preparing for them; but these LWV things are about as exciting as watching mud dry. Then we had another debate at the City Club in Cleveland. That's a tradition, that every Senatorial race ends with a debate the last week in Cleveland. So you spend a lot of time preparing for that. Betts had a few nit picking things he attacked me for, but I was ready for them. It, too, was mostly sweetness and light. The only thing that really surprised me was the size of my margin. I won by a million six, which was the largest winning margin by a major statewide candidate in the history of Ohio--according to the Secretary of State. Reagan won by a million one and I led Carter by half a million votes. I don't know how you put these things together. This election ought to keep you guys busy for years. One thing I'm sure was involved was the conservative drift--whatever conservative means, and no one has ever defined it to my satisfaction. But there was a conservative drift. Yet you had Sam Davine, Reagan's campaign manager in Ohio and a congressman for 24 or 26 years getting beaten. He was Reagan's campaign manager. There was one other thing that I think entered in, and that was the lack of a

X This is back line to use when he goes in the track later - this is how J.S. - yet he showed character! Stage 3

positive campaign. When the President came to Ohio, I implored him and the members of his staff to come in with a positive campaign. He didn't. He came in with a completely negative, cut and shoot attack on 'Ronnie Reagan, Ronnie Reagan, Ronnie Reagan.' I almost crawled under the platform. You can't come in preaching morality with your Bible under your ^{and} arm, proceed to cut someone's balls off. All he did was cut and shoot and scrape. That's not what people want to hear. It was terrible. Maybe it would have been better if he had stayed away. I don't know. Were you in Ohio before or after the ^{State} Democratic Convention? Did I tell you what I said there? Well I was in the middle of my key note speech, which was supposed to be just a 'hoorah' for the Democrats when I stopped. I said 'I want to say something now that's been bugging me and I can't hold it in any longer. I said that I don't think the American people care whether Jimmy Carter is in or out of the Rose Garden, who is or is not wearing white sheets or whether or not we are going to teach evolution one way or another. I said that I think the American people are interested in the important things in the world that have to do with how we are going to live 5, 10, 15 years from now and how our children are going to live in this world. I said that I hoped the candidates would address themselves to those questions--the big questions and not the trivial questions--and that from now on we could have a campaign that focussed on the important issues. Then I stopped. I expected stoney silence because that was pretty critical talk to a bunch of Democrats. I wouldn't have been surprised at a few boos from the back of the room. But the roof came off! It was the biggest ovation anybody got at the entire convention. And if the Democrats felt that way, you can imagine how the rest of the country must have felt. They wanted to hear something positive. And yet, negative campaigns defeated a lot of people this year in congressional races. So how do you figure that? I think

people hold the President to a higher standard than they do congressional candidates. They may lie to people in their own lives, and cheat people and even cheat on their wives, but when they vote for president ~~they want~~ someone up there (he points upward), someone who represents what they want to be, not who they are. They don't think that way about congressional candidates. I have always believed that if an opponent says something you think is unfair, hit him back. Hit him just as hard as you possibly can. But then, go on to talk positively about your vision for the future, for the kind of world you want our children to live in. You can't just cut and shoot.

Did election affect him. "From a personal standpoint, I'll be OK. I get along well with the Republicans. But the big effect will be on the staff. We will lose a lot of staff positions, and it will tear up some good staff. We don't know how much yet, because the Republicans haven't decided how they want to organize the Congress. They could completely abolish some subcommittees. Of course the minority will get some positions. Carl will be OK (Carl was sitting there) but the fellow we hired to do the far east will have to go." (Carl said.)

Staff will drop from 30 to 4 on Glenn's gov. ops. subcommittee. But Glenn only talked about foreign relations. He never mentioned gov. Ops.

"~~Los~~^{ship}ing my subcommittee chairman means I won't be able to call Carl anymore and say, let's hold hearings on Taiwan or whatever. We'll have to work through the majority."

"I get along well with Chuck Percy, though. We cosponsored the resolution on the nuclear proliferation resolution. I did 2/3 or 3/4 of the work and he did one-quarter. But we worked together on that. We also worked together on the Korean troupe withdrawal. We see eye to eye on most things and he has always been very nice to me. The only time we differed on the

floor--with some acrimony was on nuclear fuel sales to India. And he has never been able to explain his position satisfactorily to me. Apparently he had ~~some~~ friend in India who dropped in on him from time to time. Some of the others won't be as easy. Jesse Helms will be a burr under the saddle. If he becomes subcommittee chairman, that won't be fun. If Hayak^{awa}~~erman~~ gets it, then that won't be so bad. Maybe he'll just sleep and I can run the committee (laughs).

Then he goes into long description of how ^{Hayakawa} ~~he~~ sleeps all the time. "He'll come in and listen and within five minutes his head nods and his eyes close. Then he'll wake up and say something and then he'll nod off again. At least it isn't as bad as Cliff Case. He would take his seat in the Senate, throw his head back and sleep with his mouth open (he demonstrates). I used to be embarrassed for the Senate. At least you can't tell when Sam is asleep. He just nods to one side." (again he demonstrates).

Carl says he thinks Dems will make more out of minority than Republicans did. That Javits was influential--and Percy same-- because they worked at it, but Lugar and Hay^{awa}~~ackerman~~ were inactive. He thinks Dems can be active with "seminars and will be--that they have agendas.

Mary Jane and I had lunch. She was asked about JG's reaction to "Right Stuff." "He likes it." He is a straight arrow, a square. He loves his wife and his kids. And what's wrong with that?"

She said "He started two years behind in Ohio. When he came here, he said he wasn't going to go back to Ohio until he became a legislator. He went back some but not much for the first two years. When he started to go back to the state, we felt he needed to make up for lost time. So we refused over 99% of all the outside speaking requests he got. And we got hundreds of them. Now that he's been reelected, we have changed that policy. We are going to accept them and see what kind of response he gets."