

The first thing I would say about managing a campaign is you can't manage a campaign if you can't manage yourself. So I think the first thing you have to do in managing a campaign is to get and keep certain techniques, certain tools, certain habits, ways of doing things that will aid you in staying a good manager, first of yourself, before others. I think the second thing in managing a campaign is how you react to bad news. There will be bad news. And so what you have to do is react in a problem solving way, not in a ventilating way. If you react badly to bad news, then what happens is your subordinates will make every effort to avoid delivering you any bad news. And then you're in trouble because then you'll hear about it, but it will be too late, and not from them. So that's the second thing I would say. The third thing I would say about managing a campaign is that it's less about "rah rah," and delivering inspirational speeches just to the troops, than it is about a quiet competence. My experience is that people tend to respond most to that. As you're getting on an airplane and you're passing the flight deck, you don't want to hear one pilot say to the other, "What the hell's that light?" "I don't know, I've never seen that light before." You want to think there's nothing that they're going to come across that's going to throw them. Or you're going under the anesthetic for the surgery and the doctor says "What the hell is that?" I mean, so I think leadership is sometimes misunderstood as some kind of "We're going to storm the hill," or whatever. I think it's more about a sense that you can handle anything and you're not going to be surprised.

[INTERVIEWER] It sounds also like leading by example.

Yeah it certainly is. The fourth thing I would say about managing a campaign is to ask questions. I just think that's vital. I say to people all the time, "I don't have all the answers. I know the right questions to ask." And that's very important. People that know enough to know the right questions, and have an attitude that they're not afraid to ask questions, to be seen not to have all the answers, are doubly advantaged.

John F. Kennedy was my inspiration for public service. I was 13 when he was elected and 16 when he was killed, so I was at that age where you're starting to pay attention to the world outside of your block. And second only to Kennedy was Winston Churchill, who was a big deal for many Americans for a long time. I've got my Churchill tie on at the moment. And I think really it was then that I got a sense of what should motivate you to be in public life. And it shouldn't be the silly things. There are only so many planes you

can fly on, hotels you can stay in, restaurants you can eat in, dates you can go on. All that stuff as a reason to get involved in politics is not very good. What I got from John F. Kennedy, principally, but also from others, is I guess what used to be called *noblesse oblige*, the obligations of nobility. And so the way I've thought about it through the years is in the history of the world, what a teeny tiny percentage of privileged people I'm in. If you think of society as one big pot into which a group of people put in, but take out more, and then there's a second group that puts in about what they take out, there needs to be a third group that makes up for the first group, that puts back more than they take out. And if I'm not in that teeny tiny percentage of people to do that, who is?

I was finishing up college when I had my first chance to do something about my interest. In 1968 there was talk that Robert F. Kennedy was going to perhaps run for president. And so I got my congressional directory off the shelf so I could look up his phone number and I called the Washington office from Detroit and offered my great services, and they said "Well he hasn't decided to run yet." But another couple weeks or so he did, so I called again and they said "Well if you really want to help call BJ Warren in Indianapolis, who's running the state." So I called, the Indiana primary was the first primary he was entering, and it turned out BJ Warren was a woman, and she said "Well if you really want to help, call Al Guskin in Ann Arbor." Guskin was a social psychologist on the faculty, had been a director in the Peace Corps in the Kennedy administration and had been asked by Bobby to work on the students on the campuses. So Guskin and I organized the campuses of the colleges and universities in Michigan, and when it came time to take these students to neighboring Indiana to work in the primary, as a faculty member he had to stay and I became the leader of this group. And they liked what I did and they asked me to stay, so I stayed in Fort Wayne and ran a good piece of Fort Wayne in that campaign, and we won. Then I went on to the California primary and did the same thing in Los Angeles. I was upstairs on the fifth floor when the senator went down to the mezzanine, and I was getting results called in on the phone from upstate California and I was writing them down and Kennedy came and was looking over my shoulder what I was writing, and I covered up the phone, I said "It looks pretty good." And he said, "Yeah we're going down." So he went down to give his victory speech and that was last that we saw him. So I was scheduled to work a New York primary, which in those days came after California, and I flew out the next day, knowing I'd either work on that or the funeral, and it turned out to be the funeral. So that was my

maiden voyage. He was surely the greatest man that I've ever known to this day. 85% of what I know about politics to this day I learned on that campaign.

How would you manage a campaign, how is a campaign structured? Here's what you need to know. There are three parts to a campaign: money, message, and politics. Money has two parts: fundraising and the treasury operation. Counting the money, filing FEC reports or whatever it is. Message has five parts: it's got free media – the press – paid media – putting up ads on television – polling, issues research, and speechwriting. Those are the five elements to message. Politics has two parts: field and politics politics. Field is organizing and approaching the electorate geographically by where they live, and politics politics is by interest group. You know there's women's groups or labor, or whatever it happens to be, education. There's really a fourth that supports the other three, and that's scheduling, which has scheduling and advance. And the scheduling job is the hardest job on any campaign, because unlike school where if you get 99% right you get an A, in scheduling if you get 1% wrong you flunked.

You know the rise of the primaries, which in 1968 we had more of, which was my first campaign, than let's say John F. Kennedy had in 1960 when there was just a handful, we had a little more than that in 1968, but the explosion didn't come until after that. And so the old control that governors of that party, labor unions within the Democratic Party, the party apparatus, mayors, et cetera, used to have on delegates was gone, replaced by the primaries. I think it's probably going to stay that way, I don't think there's any way of going back, but it has surely changed what happens, and it has made the conventions generally I think less interesting to the press and less interesting to the public.

[INTERVIEWER] And more scripted.

Yeah it's, that's right, it's more of a scripted thing. It's big in a couple of showpiece ways for perhaps the keynote address and certainly for the address of the presidential nominee.

The biggest change of course that everyone talks about with respect to technology, then bridges you into changes in media and that's in all the social networking, and first of all the Internet, and I guess even before that the proliferation of cable channels and cable news and everything. So it

used be that you had a little longer to see and seize opportunities to make news, and to enjoy news if it's good, and suffer if it's bad. And now the half life of these news stories is so short, the amount of time that a candidate, even for president, will appear on-screen in the nightly news in a sound bite is I think now seven seconds. It used to be 30, 35, 40 seconds. So now if you're in the kitchen making dinner and you hear your candidate on TV, before you can put down whatever, he's gone, he's not on the news anymore, they've moved on to something else. So it obviously has dramatically compressed the timeline that campaigns have to work in. I don't think it has changed the substance so much as it has the techniques that you have to use. The fact is, when you run for office, you still have to give people a reason to vote for you. They can pretty much figure out what you getting elected is going to do to change your life. What's it going to do to change their life? And so you still have to deliver that, and I think it's also still the case for the higher offices, governor, senator, certainly President of the United States, we pick whom we're going to vote for more the way we pick a spouse, than how we pick an architect. People are making a judgment about you as a person, OK. I don't know how many kids we're going to have, or where we're going to live 10 years from now, or what the wallpaper's going to be, but this is a quality person that I want to spend my life with. We'll work all this other stuff out. And I think that's the same thing, I like to say we play off issues to make character points, OK. So it's how you talk about the issues. What your priorities are, what your values are, that I think is what people are paying attention to.

The effect of money on campaigns these days is concerning to me, as it is I think to almost everyone. I think it's a real problem. There is this notion that's discussed at the Supreme Court and elsewhere that money is really just speech. We're just talking about an ability to communicate. So if you have freedom of speech but you don't have a chance to get it heard, you maybe don't really have freedom of speech. So therefore we should be able to spend unlimited amounts of money, just as you would be able to stand on a street corner and talk for an unlimited period of time. That's a pretty juvenile view, a pretty naïve view of things. The fact of the matter is the people who have the most money are therefore able to have the most speech. That's a reality, and so the fact that a poor person has the same freedom that a rich person has is a meaningless freedom. They can't act on it. They don't have the capacity to act on it. And so if we want to avoid a situation where the wealthiest can, by spending money, perpetuate policies or enact new policies that have the foreseeable consequence of preserving

and enhancing further their wealth, to the exclusion of everything else, we're going to have to come to grips with this somehow. I think the public funding idea has some merits, but is very hard to get past, to get people to part with tax dollars. And it's very hard to figure out an equitable, sensible way to allocate the dollars. So I tend to come back to a more traditional view, which is there should be some limits on how much money can be spent in various ways, and also there should be full disclosure. At the very least, one ought to be able to tell not only what is being said to me, but who's saying it to me. And so I think the ability to disguise where the money is coming from is hard, really, to reconcile with an idea of good government that comes from a support for freedom of speech.