

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN 10/31/94

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

John Deane / Ed - Brian
Lester
Cotton

D'A
Emin

Brian / Wadman
SS

A true political reflex machine

Let's begin, as the lawyers say, with a couple of stipulations. First, under the one-dollar, one-vote system that has made our nation great, anybody who has 400,000 legitimate bucks to donate to either or both of our two splendid political parties can secure the studious attention of any name-brand politician in the United States of America. Second, there is no such thing as a purely social visit with any president of the United States—and certainly not with Bill Clinton.

Clinton, I suspect, talks politics and public policy in his sleep. As with all gifted narcissists, talking about his work is partly a way of talking about himself. I once spoke with a fellow who made the mistake of taking Clinton along on a turkey hunt, a sport which involves hiking into the forest before dawn and sitting camouflaged, stock still and silent for hours.

To devotees, one of the joys of turkey hunting is how, after 10 or 15 minutes of stillness, the forest comes alive. Deer and turkey hunters often return from the woods empty-handed but exhilarated after having watched, say, a bobcat teaching its kitten to stalk quail.

Clinton, on the other hand, was merely bored. Since he never shut up, the woods around him remained as barren of wildlife as a Wal-Mart parking lot. He couldn't see the sport's appeal.

Why, after all, sit out in the damp and cold to discuss the complexities of tariffs and tax codes or Clinton's chances of winning Florida's electoral votes when the same conversation could just as easily take place over a bacon cheeseburger? Or even while jogging?

But I digress. The point is that if there's a human ear within range, Clinton's going to fill it with chatter about politics or policy. Anybody who's ever been in the same room with the man for 15 minutes has had the experience of watching some unfortunate soul, thrilled and excited to be in the presence of the president of the United States, make the mistake of asking Clinton a question about, say, campaign finance reform.

Fifteen minutes later, with the president having enumerated the merits and shortcomings of the McCain-Feingold bill in comparison to three rival proposals, two recent Supreme Court decisions and an op-ed

Gene Lyons



piece by Sen. Bill Bradley, his listeners are beginning to shift restlessly from one foot to another and steal covert glances at their wristwatches.

Conversely, Clinton will also pump any and everybody he meets for every useful scrap of information that has any conceivable relationship to politics and/or governance. The man is, in brief, a perfectly functioning political reflex machine—the most gifted of his generation.

A substantial part of his genius is his matchless ability to persuade himself that whatever's good for Bill Clinton is by definition good for the United States of America, and vice versa. It follows that whatever his faults, greed isn't among them.

Republicans and the so-called "investigative" reporters in the Washington press corps could save themselves a lot of run-

ning around if they'd simply figure that out. The president's interest in money, as the Whitewater affair ought to have demonstrated conclusively to anybody even faintly interested in the facts, is limited strictly to its political utility.

Ponder the sad example of Jim McDougal, who did his best to curry Clinton's favor, and subsequently his patronage. His reward? A borrowed mobile home on somebody else's land and an income limited to SSI disability payments.

All the combined efforts of the national press corps, Republican investigators from both houses of Congress and the independent counsel have yet to document a single corrupt favor. Not even a sewer permit.

You can rent Clinton's ear, in short, if you'll lend him yours. But low-grade corruption in the form of crude exchanges of money in return for specific favors? Let's put it this way: It's precisely Clinton's failure to deliver the goods to even the most generous campaign contributors that's partly responsible for his reputation as a waffler and breaker of promises. Examples are legion, going all the way back to the ancient contro-

versy over 80,000-pound truck weight limits during his first term as Arkansas governor.

All the trucking and poultry industries wanted in return for supporting candidate Clinton in that long ago 1978 election was an increase in allowable truck weights on Arkansas highways from 73,280 to 80,000 pounds—and without new taxes. It took them several terms and an expensive detour through the U.S. Supreme Court to remove Clinton's "ton-mile" tax to get them—by which time all 49 other states had long since yielded.

Maybe if Michael Kelly's highly influential (in Washington) piece in *The New York Times Magazine* early in the Clinton presidency had gotten the truck-weight story halfway right, we wouldn't be doomed to what's shaping up as yet another massive snipe hunt.

This time, they're calling it Indogate. Its premise is Whitewater writ large: In exchange for generous campaign donations to the Democratic National Committee, Clinton bestowed corrupt benefits upon the Lippo Group, an Asian banking conglomerate controlled by the Riady family.

Nobody I've spoken with who knows James Riady describes him as stupid, dishonest or lacking in subtlety. As a longtime Clinton acquaintance and veteran of Arkansas politics and banking, he would know better than to offer a bribe or ask for a specific favor. Merely being known to have the president's ear would be reason enough to make a donation to the DNC.

But, of course, the two men discussed Asian trade policy and the complicated question of how to deal with China when Riady called at the White House. As an ethnic Chinese who does business all over Asia and who also knows America, who better than Riady to consult?

So am I shocked that two weeks before the election, White House aide Bruce Lindsey, with the press mob in hyperkinetic overdrive over "the Asian connection," failed to bare his soul to the likes of our old pals Jeff Gerth and Stephen Labaton of *The New York Times*?

Dear reader, I am shocked speechless.

Gene Lyons is a Little Rock author. His column appears every Wednesday.

From Wed ADG

we need to figure out how to circulate

7/1/98 Indogate

Me 2
Lester
Coville
Ann L
Heav
ab

Dease

Butter
copy

10.7.94

President William Jefferson Clinton
Press Conference Statement
October 6, 1994

We came here twenty months ago to make America work for
~~take on tough issues, get our econ. house in order.~~
ordinary people again. There have been some tough fights along
~~the contract w/ Amer. people is a contract for our future.~~
~~the way. But they are the right ones. And, if we stick to our~~
~~guns, we will keep moving our country forward. Today, we have~~
~~fresh evidence that the national economic program we fought for~~
~~last year is making a difference for the American people.~~
~~When we go from here,~~

~~When I ran for this office, I promised that if we did the~~
~~right things, the economy would be able to create 8 million jobs~~
~~in four years. Now, in less than half that time, we are more~~
~~than half way toward our goal.~~

~~I can live w/ an economic strategy: Reduce the def,~~
~~expand trade, clean up costs, Def cons, technology.~~
~~This morning, the Department of Labor reported that the~~
~~unemployment rate fell to 5.9%, and the economy created more than~~
~~4.6 million jobs in less than two years. It's not enough. But~~
~~few short years ago, we were exporting our jobs. Now that we are~~
~~getting our economic house in order, jobs are being created here.~~

We made this start by passing historic deficit reduction.
We cut spending by over \$255 billion, with cuts in over 300
programs. We are ~~shrinking~~ the federal workforce to its
smallest size in over thirty years. And we will have three years
of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was
president. We are not satisfied, but we have made a real start.

~~shrinking~~

This Congress, as it concludes a difficult session, showed that it could make a difference when it put people and progress ahead of narrow interests and obstruction.

On crime, we got a start: banning assault weapons, making three strikes and you're out the law of the land, and helping communities over the next five years to hire 100,000 new police.

bring 100,000 police officers for schools

On education, we've made real progress: making college loans more affordable for twenty million American middle class families, adopting tough standards for our schools, and reforming aid to elementary and secondary schools. And we began national service, giving students and others a chance to serve their communities in exchange for help with training or higher education.

On jobs, we began to break down trade barriers so we could increase American exports to Mexico and bring jobs back to America. And in the name of rewarding work, we cut taxes for 15 million working families. This is what we mean by making Washington work for ordinary people.

But, in recent weeks, there were far too many times when an idea for creating jobs, reforming government, educating students, or expanding incomes was met by someone who would stand up and try to stop it, slow it, kill it, or talk it to death.

Many of these same people have signed what they're calling their contract -- a contract to explode the deficit, cut Medicare, hurt the recovery, and divide our people. The contract I signed with the American people promises to build a better future and bring people together. And I will keep honoring that contract, because I want our country to keep moving forward.

In that spirit, I have asked Congress to return after the election to pass the GATT world trade agreement. By cutting tariffs around the world, GATT, over the next decade, will mean a \$744 billion global tax cut, and generate hundreds of thousands of new jobs for American workers. GATT will keep America's recovery going and sustain growth around the world.

Despite the good it will do, Congress has put the brakes on passing the legislation we need to enact the GATT. That's wrong, and it is bad for America.

We will not retreat on GATT. And we won't go back on the other initiatives we've started and that America needs. That's wrong, and Americans want action on the business Congress left unfinished.

I regret that the Republican leaders of Congress engaged in partisan maneuvering that put the special interests ahead of the national interest.

April 5, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO NANCY HERNREICH

FROM: Capricia Marshall
SUBJECT: Congressional Medal of Honor

Awhile back the President asked me whether or not Bob Hope received the Congressional Medal of Honor - He has not. He has received Presidential Medal of Freedom. This is per the White House Clerk's Office.

Don't want
to meet

ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECH
OLD STATE HOUSE, LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

OCTOBER 3, 1991

Thank you all for being here today, for your friendship and support, for giving me the opportunity to serve as your Governor for 11 years, for filling my life full of blessings beyond anything I ever deserved.

I want to thank especially Hillary and Chelsea for taking this big step in our life's journey together. Hillary, for being my wife, my friend, and my partner in our efforts to build a better future for the children and families of Arkansas and America. Chelsea, in ways she is only now coming to understand, has been our constant joy and reminder of what our public efforts are really all about: a better life for all who will work for it, a better future for the next generation.

All of you, in different ways, have brought me here today, to step beyond a life and a job I love, to make a commitment to a larger cause: preserving the American Dream ... restoring the hopes of the forgotten middle class ... reclaiming the future for our children.

I refuse to be part of a generation that celebrates the death of communism abroad with the loss of the American Dream at home.

I refuse to be a part of a generation that fails to compete in the global economy and so condemns hard-working Americans to a life of struggle without reward or security.

That is why I stand here today, because I refuse to stand by and let our children become part of the first generation to do worse than their parents. I don't want my child or your child to be part of a country that's coming apart instead of coming together.

Over 25 years ago, I had a professor at Georgetown who taught me that America was the greatest country in history because our people believed in and acted on two simple ideas: first, that the future can be better than the present; and second, that each of us has a personal, moral responsibility to make it so.

That fundamental truth has guided my public career, and brings me here today. It is what we've devoted ourselves to here in Arkansas. I'm proud of what we've done here in Arkansas together. Proud of the work we've done to become a laboratory of democracy and innovation. And proud that we've done it without giving up the things we cherish and honor most about our way of life — solid, middle class values of work, faith, family, individual responsibility and community.

As I've traveled across our state, I've found that everything we believe in, everything we've fought for, is threatened by an administration that refuses to take care of our own, has turned its back on the middle class, and is afraid to change while the world is changing.

The historic events in the Soviet Union in recent months teach us an important lesson: National security begins at home. For the Soviet Empire never lost to us on the field of battle. Their system rotted from the inside out, from economic, political and spiritual failure.

To be sure, the collapse of communism requires a new national security policy. I applaud the President's recent initiative in reducing nuclear weapons. It is an important beginning. But make no mistake — the end of the Cold War is not the end of threats to America. The world is still a dangerous and uncertain place. The first and most solemn obligation of the President is to keep America strong and safe from foreign dangers and promote democracy around the world.

The country is headed in the wrong direction: fast shipping behind losing our way, and all we have out of Washington is status quo paralysis. No vision, no action, just neglect, selfishness and

PHOTOCOPY
WJC HANDWRITING

But we cannot build a safe and secure world unless we can first
~~make America strong at home. It is our ability to take care of our own at home that~~
gives us the strength to stand up for what we believe around the world.

As Governor for 11 years, working to preserve and create jobs in a global economy, I know our competition for the future is Germany and the rest of Europe, Japan and the rest of Asia. And I know that we are losing America's leadership in the world because we're losing the American Dream right here at home.

Middle class people are spending more hours on the job, spending less time with their children, bringing home a smaller paycheck to pay more for health care and housing and education. Our streets are meaner, our families are broken, our health care is the costliest in the world and we get less for it.

The country is headed in the wrong direction fast, slipping behind, losing our way ... and all we have out of Washington is status quo paralysis. No vision, no action. Just neglect, selfishness and division.

For 12 years, Republicans have tried to divide us — race against race — so we get mad at each other and not at them. They want us to look at each other across a racial divide so we don't turn and look to the White House and ask, Why are all of our incomes going down? Why are all of us losing jobs? Why are we losing our future?

Where I come from we know about race-baiting. They've used it to divide us for years. I know this tactic well and I'm not going to let them get away with it.

For 12 years, the Republicans have talked about choice without really believing in it. George Bush says he wants school choice even if it bankrupts the public schools, and yet he's more than willing to make it a crime for the women of America to exercise their individual right to choose.

For 12 years, the Republicans have been telling us that America's problems aren't their problem. They washed their hands of responsibility for the economy and education and health care and social policy and turned it over to fifty states and a thousand points of light. Well, here in Arkansas we've done our best to create jobs and educate our people. And each of us has tried to be one of those thousand points of light. But I can tell you, where there is no national vision, no national partnership, no national leadership, a thousand points of light leaves a lot of darkness.

We must provide the answers, the solutions. And we will. We're going to turn this country around and get it moving again, and we're going to fight for the hard-working middle-class families of America for a change.

Make no mistake. This election is about change: in our party, in our national leadership, and in our country.

And we're not going to get positive change just by Bush-bashing. We have to do a better job of the old-fashioned work of confronting the real problems of real people and pointing the way to a better future. That is our challenge in 1992.

Today, as we stand on the threshold of a new era, a new millennium, I believe we need a new kind of leadership, leadership committed to change. Leadership not mired in the politics of the past, not limited by old ideologies. Proven leadership that knows how to reinvent government to help solve the real problems of real people.

That is why today I am declaring my candidacy for President of the United States. Together I believe we can provide leadership that will restore the American Dream, that will fight for the forgotten middle class, that will provide more opportunity, insist on more responsibility, and create a greater sense of community for

We cannot
build a safe and
secure world
unless we can
first make
America strong
at home.

this great country.

The change we must make isn't liberal or conservative. It's born, and it's different. The small towns and main streets of America aren't like the corridors and back rooms of Washington. People out here don't care about the idle rhetoric of "left" and "right" and "liberal" and "conservative" and all the other words that have made our politics a substitute for action. These families are crying out desperately for someone who believes the promise of America is to help them with their struggle to get ahead, to offer them a green light instead of a pink slip.

This must be a campaign of ideas, not slogans. We don't need another President who doesn't know what he wants to do for America. I'm going to tell you in plain language what I intend to do as President. How we can meet the challenges we face — that's the test for all the Democratic candidates in this campaign. Americans know what we're up against. Let's show them what we're for.

We need a new covenant to rebuild America. It's just common sense. Government's responsibility is to create more opportunity. The people's responsibility is to make the most of it.

In a Clinton Administration, we are going to create opportunity for all. We've got to grow this economy, not shrink it. We need to give people incentives to make long-term investment in America and reward people who produce goods and services, not those who speculate with other people's money. We've got to invest more money in emerging technologies to help keep high-paying jobs here at home. We've got to convert from a defense to a domestic economy.

We've got to expand world trade, tear down barriers, but demand fair trade policies if we're going to provide good jobs for our people. The American people don't want to run from the world. We must meet the competition and win.

Opportunity for all means world-class skills and world-class education. We need more than "photo ops" and empty rhetoric — we need standards and accountability and excellence in education. On this issue, I'm proud to say that Arkansas has led the way.

In a Clinton Administration, students and parents and teachers will get a *real* education President.

Opportunity for all means pre-school for every child who needs it, and an apprenticeship program for kids who don't want to go to college but do want good jobs. It means teaching everybody with a job to read, and passing a domestic GI Bill that would give every young American the chance to borrow the money necessary to go to college and ask them to pay it back either as a small percentage of their income over time or through national service as teachers or policemen or nurses or child care workers.

In a Clinton Administration, everyone will be able to get a college loan as long as they're willing to give something back to their country in return.

Opportunity for all means reforming the health care system to control costs, improve quality, expand preventive and long-term care, maintain consumer choice, and cover everybody. And we don't have to bankrupt the taxpayers to do it. We do have to take on the big insurance companies and health care bureaucracies and get some real cost control into the system. I pledge to the American people that in the first year of a Clinton Administration we will present a plan to Congress and the American people to provide affordable, quality health care for all Americans.

Opportunity for all means making our cities and our streets safe from crime and drugs. Across America, citizens are banding together to take their streets and neighborhoods back. In a Clinton Administration, we'll be on their side —

Make no
mistake. This
election is
about change.
In our party, in
our national
leadership, and
in our country.

PHOTOCOPY
WJC HANDWRITING

with new initiatives like community policing, drug treatment for addicts, need it and boot camps for first-time offenders.

Opportunity for all means making taxes fair. I'm not out to soak the rich. I wouldn't mind being rich. But I do believe the rich should pay their fair share. For 12 years, the Republicans have raised taxes on the middle class. It's time to give the middle class tax relief.

Finally, opportunity for all means we must protect our environment and develop an energy policy that relies more on conservation and clean natural gas so all our children will inherit a world that is cleaner, safer, and more beautiful.

But hear me now. I honestly believe that if we try to do these things, we will still not solve the problems of today or move into the next century with confidence unless we do what President Kennedy did and ask every American citizen to assume personal responsibility for the future of our country.

The government owes our people more opportunity, but we all have to make the most of it through responsible citizenship.

We should insist that people move off welfare rolls and onto work rolls. We should give people on welfare the skills they need to succeed, but we should demand that everybody who can work go to work and become a productive member of society.

We should insist on the toughest possible child support enforcement. Governments don't raise children, parents do. And when they don't their children pay forever, and so do we.

And we have got to say, as we've tried to do in Arkansas, that students have a responsibility to stay in school. If you drop out for no good reason, you should lose your driver's license. But it's important to remember that the most irresponsible people of all in the 1980s were those at the top — not those who were doing worse, not the hard-working middle class, but those who sold out our savings and loans with bad deals and spent billions on wasteful takeovers and mergers, money that could have been spent to create better products and new jobs.

Do you know that in the 1980s, while middle-class income went down, charitable giving by working people went up? And while rich people's incomes went up, charitable giving by the wealthy went down. Why? Because our leaders had an ethic of get it while you can and to heck with everybody else.

How can you ask people who work or who are poor to behave responsibly when they know that the heads of our biggest companies raised their own pay in the last decade by four times the percentage their workers' pay went up? Three times as much as their profits went up. When they ran their companies into the ground and their employees were on the street, what did they do? They bailed out with golden parachutes to a cushy life. That's just wrong.

Teddy Roosevelt and Harry Truman and John Kennedy didn't hesitate to use the bully pulpit of the presidency. They changed America by standing up for what's right. When the Salomon Brothers abused the treasury markets, the President was silent. When the rip-off artists looted our S&L's, the President was silent. In a Clinton Administration, when people sell their companies and their workers and their country down the river, they'll get called on the carpet. We're going to insist that they invest in this country and create jobs for our people.

In the 1980s, Washington failed us, too. We spent more money on the present and the past and less on the future. We spent \$500 billion to recycle assets in the S&L mess, but we couldn't afford \$5 billion for unemployed workers or to give every kid in this country the chance to be in Head Start. We can do better than that.

Opportunity for
all means
world-class skills
and world-class
education.

and we will.

A Clinton Administration won't spend our money on programs that don't solve problems and a government that doesn't work. I want to reinvent government to make it more efficient and more effective. I want to give citizens more choices in the services they get, and empower them to make those choices. That's what we've tried to do in Arkansas. We've balanced the budget every year and improved services. We've treated taxpayers like our customers and our bosses, because they are.

I want the American people to know that a Clinton Administration will defend our national interests abroad, put their values into our social policy at home, and spend their tax money with discipline. We'll put government back on the side of the hard-working middle-class families of America who think most of the help goes to those at the top of the ladder, some goes to the bottom, and no one speaks for them.

But we need more than new laws, new promises, or new programs. We need a new spirit of community, a sense that we are all in this together. If we have no sense of community, the American Dream will continue to wither. Our destiny is bound up with the destiny of every other American. We're all in this together, and we will rise or fall together.

A few years ago, Hillary and I visited a classroom in Los Angeles, in an area plagued by drugs and gangs. We talked to a dozen sixth-graders, whose number one concern was being shot going to and from school. Their second worry was turning 12 or 13 and being forced to join a gang or be beaten. And finally, they were worried about their own parents' drug abuse.

Nearly half a century ago, I was born not far from here, in Hope, Arkansas. My mother had been widowed three months before I was born. I was raised for four years by my grandparents, while she went back to nursing school. They didn't have much money. I spent a lot of time with my great-grandparents. By any standard, they were poor. But we didn't blame other people. We took responsibility for ourselves and for each other because we knew we could do better. I was raised to believe in the American Dream, in family values, in individual responsibility, and in the obligation of government to help people who were doing the best they could.

It's a long way in America from that loving family which is embodied today in a picture on my wall: in the Governor's office of me at the age of six holding my great-grandfather's hand to an America where children on the streets of our cities don't know who their grandparents are and have to worry about their own parents' drug abuse.

I tell you, by making common cause with those children we give new life to the American dream. And that is our generation's responsibility — to form a New Covenant ... more opportunity for all, more responsibility from everyone, and a greater sense of common purpose.

I believe with all my heart that together we can make this happen. We can usher in a new era of progress, prosperity and renewal. We can. We must. This is not just a campaign for the presidency — it is a campaign for the future, for the forgotten hard-working middle class families of America who deserve a government that fights for them. A campaign to keep America strong at home and around the world. Join with us. I ask for your prayers, your help, your hands, and your hearts. Together we can make America great again, and build a community of hope that will inspire the world.

We need a
New Covenant
to rebuild
America. It's
not a common
sense
Government's
responsibility is
to create more
opportunity.
The people's
responsibility is
to make the
most of it."

THE WHITE HOUSE

- ✓ ~~What was our~~ ^{What was} ~~our~~ ^{our} ~~relationship~~ ^{relationship} ?
 ✓ ~~concern~~ ^{concern} ~~in getting agreement~~ ^{in getting agreement} ?
 ✓ ~~What will~~ ^{What will} ~~us say~~ ^{us say} ?
 ✓ ~~What will~~ ^{What will} ~~expect~~ ^{expect} ?
 ✓ ~~What will~~ ^{What will} ~~anish~~ ^{anish} ~~effects be~~ ^{effects be} ?
 ✓ ~~What can~~ ^{What can} ~~we do w/ GATT?~~ ^{we do w/ GATT?} ?
 ✓ ~~how can~~ ^{how can} ~~they~~ ^{they} ~~relate~~ ^{relate} ?

① Procurement - T. III

② Rules S. 301

③ Auto / Auto Pb - 60 to 80

- x Poll
 ① 301
 ② in 301 sub
 X Trade Zone
Customs
 ③ Baru

 A) Tag Govt Reg - Regl. Pb
 B) JPUS Optim - Orig Pb
 C) Auto Int'l Tip Reg

✓ extend existing agreements

94 SEP 30 P6:30

NOT on
Japan history
7-22-94

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

9/23/94

94 SEP 23 10:38

September 23, 1994

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOAN N. BAGGETT

SUBJECT: 1994 CONGRESSIONAL RACES

The attached analysis, prepared by NCEC Director Mark Gersh, reflects the collective judgement of the party committees and the White House political and legislative teams as to the current state of play in the midterms.

CC Lead

PHOTOCOPY
WJC HANDWRITING



From: JNB
Subject: 1994 Congressional Race

NCEC

(NCEC Doc)

The following analysis was prepared by Mark Gersh and reflects the collective judgement of the party committees and the White House political and legislative teams as to the current state of play in the midterms

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

10 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10016
(212) 686-4905

507 Capitol Court, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 547-1151

Chairman

Thomas Scheuer

Vice Chairmen

Henry Steele Commager

George R. Donahue

Secretary

Muriel G. Blumenthal

Treasurer

James E. Byron

National Director

Russell Hemenway

Washington Director

Mark Gersh

Directors

Steve Allen

Harry Ashmore*

Muriel G. Blumenthal*

Stimson Bullitt

Robert B. Choate

Blair Clark*

Henry Steele Commager*

Maxwell Dane*

Joan K. Davidson*

Mark B. Dayton

George R. Donahue*

Joan Pyle Dufault

Nicholas D. Etcheverry*

Ruth P. Field

Robert B. Gimbel

Cynthia Harris

Jane Hart

Carol W. Haussamen

Dennis Heffernan

Russell Hemenway*

Harry Kahn

Irvin Lerner

Frances Lear

Orin Lehman

S. Jay Levy

James Michener

Don Montgomery

James Montgomery

Bishop Paul Moore, Jr.

Stewart R. Mott*

Jean R. Pennybacker*

Laughlin Phillips

Gary Ratner

Thomas Scheuer*

Telford Taylor*

Helen C. Vanderbilt*

George Wald

George Wallerstein

William Woodward III

*Executive Board

TO: Interested Parties
FROM: Mark Gersh
RE: Congressional District Overview

OVERVIEW OF THE HOUSE

* 256 Democrats, 178 Republicans and 1 Independent. The GOP, with a net gain of 40 seats, would gain control of the House in 1995. 162 Democratic and 133 Republican held seats are reasonably safe. 39 additional races (20 Democratic, 19 Republican) are likely to be retained. Vermont 1 will be retained by the Independent, Bernie Sanders. Remaining are exactly 100 races (74 Democratic and 26 Republican).

Mired on the defensive, the Democrats will have difficulty overcoming the inherent disadvantages illustrated by these numbers. Effectively, two of the 74 Democratic seats are likely to be lost - New Jersey 2 (Hughes) and Illinois 11 (Sangmeister), both open seats. Marginal incumbents, vulnerable in this environment, are disproportionately Democratic. Marginal open seats, particularly in the south, are almost without exception Democratic.

EXPECTATIONS

Current House: 256 D - 178 R - 1 I

Previous mid-term performances:

Democrats

Carter (1978) - 15
Johnson (1966) - 47
Kennedy (1962) - 5
Truman (1950) - 29

Post war average - 24

Republicans

Bush (1990) - 8
Reagan (1986) - 5
Reagan (1982) - 26
Nixon (1974) - 43
Eisenhower (1958) - 47
Eisenhower (1954) - 18

Post war average - 25

Eleanor Roosevelt (1884-1962)
Sidney H. Scheuer (1893-1987)
Hans J. Morgenthau (1904-1980)
Thomas K. Finletter (1893-1980)
Barbara W. Tuchman (1912-1989)

An analysis shows we have a chance to beat these averages, and are certain to sustain fewer losses than presidents in 1958, 1966 and 1974. Special circumstances - recession in 1958, war in 1966, and a scandal in 1974, produced those results.

A Republican gain of 25 seats would give them more seats than any time since 1956; a gain of 27 seats would match their 1954 strength.

OPEN SEATS

* 50 Open Seats (30 Democratic, 20 Republican)

Republicans are favored to win 11 of 30 Democratic open seats, and possess an even chance to win 10 additional Democratic seats. Only 5 of 30 open seats represent near-certain Democratic victories.

Republicans will defend 20 open seats. 4 are highly probable retentions. Democrats are favored to win 2 GOP open seats, and 14 races are marginal (5 toss-ups and 9 tentative Republican leads).

11 of 25 marginal Democratic open seats are in the south.

3 of 16 marginal Republican open seats are in the south.

ANALYSIS

* The Republicans should win a minimum of 15 and a maximum of 20 Democratic open seats. The Democrats have good chances in 5-8 Republican open seats. Therefore a net loss of 7-15 open seats is likely.

INCUMBENTS

Only 12 Republican incumbents are highly vulnerable at this juncture:

Alaska 1 (Young)
Arkansas 4 (Dickey)
Connecticut 5 (Franks)
California 43 (Calvert)
Florida 12 (Canady)
Iowa 2 (Nussle)
Iowa 3 (Lightfoot)
Kentucky 2 (Lewis)
Massachusetts 3 (Blute)
Massachusetts 6 (Torkildsen)
North Carolina 11 (Taylor)
Ohio 10 (Hoke)

17 other Republicans, seemingly ahead at this juncture, may be re-classified later. Some of the best shots are as follows:

- California 4 (Doolittle)
- California 10 (Baker)
- California 27 (Moorhead)
- Georgia 3 (Collins)
- Georgia 4 (Lindner)
- Utah 1 (Hansen)
- Wisconsin 8 (Roth)

Conversely, 50 Democratic incumbents are highly vulnerable; another 19 Democratic incumbents are potentially vulnerable.

Three Democratic incumbents are currently trailing according to most soundings: Johnson (Georgia 10), Mezvinsky (Pennsylvania 13) and Coleman (Texas 16).

Another 26 are no better than even at this time:

- English (Arizona 6)
- Lehman (California 19)
- Beilenson (California 24)
- Hamburg (California 1)
- Harman (California 36)
- Schenk (California 49)
- Darden (Georgia 7)
- Smith (Iowa 4)
- LaRocco (Idaho 1)
- Stupak (Michigan 1)
- Peterson (Minnesota 7)
- Williams (Montana 1)
- Hoagland (Nebraska 2)
- Klein (New Jersey 8)
- Hochbrueckner (New York 1)
- Hinchey (New York 26)
- Mann (Ohio 1)
- Strickland (Ohio 6)
- Fingerhut (Ohio 19)
- Holden (Pennsylvania 6)
- McHale (Pennsylvania 15)
- Sarpalius (Texas 13)
- Shepherd (Utah 2)
- Byrne (Virginia 11)
- Inslee (Washington 4)
- Kreidler (Washington 9)

21 Democrats^{✓C} incumbents, in serious trouble, have leads at this time.

If marginal incumbents in both parties sustain 50% attrition rates, the Democrats will suffer a net loss of 19 seats. Coupled with the open seat compilation, Democratic losses are likely to range from the low 20's to the low 30's.

There has been some movement toward Democratic candidates in recent days. For example, Hoagland (NE-2) has overcome a large deficit, and is now running even. Both Democratic challengers in North Carolina open seats (Moore and Sand) hold small leads, at this time. Gejdenson (CT-2) is helped by the presence of a third party candidate, and may now be ahead. In Idaho 1, Rep. LaRocco has regained the lead over Helen Chenoweth. Doug Stephens and Bob Mitchell, challengers in Republican open seats, are both running even with their opponents. Wheeler, in Mississippi 1, reportedly has a 3% lead. Hochbrueckner re-election numbers are in the 50's. Leslie Byrne may hold a narrow lead over Tom Davis in Virginia 11.

THE SOUTH

Democratic prospects in the south, dampened in recent election years, are in even more jeopardy in 1994. Retirements, delayed implications of the Voting Rights Act, and simmering conservatism, have all combined to stamp the south as a potential disaster areas. Democrats are on the defensive throughout the region, but most visibly, in Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

DEMOCRATIC SEATS - Toss-Ups and Republican Leads

A. Open - 10

- Florida 1 (Hutto)
- Florida 15 (Bacchus)
- Georgia 8 (Rowland)
- South Carolina 3 (Derrick)
- Tennessee 3 (Lloyd)
- Mississippi 1 (Whitten)
- North Carolina 2 (Valentine)
- North Carolina 5 (Neal)
- Oklahoma 4 (McCurdy)
- Texas 26 (Andrews)

B. Incumbents - 5

- Georgia 10 (Johnson)
- Texas 16 (Coleman)
- Georgia 7 (Darden)
- Texas 13 (Sarpalius)
- Virginia 11 (Byrne)

There are other vulnerable races: Democrats are only narrowly ahead in 7 incumbent and 2 open southern seats. In totality, 24 Democratic southern seats are in jeopardy.

CALIFORNIA

Currently, there are 30 Democratic and 22 Republican seats. The redistricting plan, in effect in 1992, was designed to accord each party an equal number of seats. However, anti-Bush sentiment, widely felt throughout the west, fueled a strong Democratic trend. Democrats won four districts -- Beilenson (24th), Schenk (49th), Harman (36th) and Lehman (19th), with strong Republican tendencies. This year, all four seats, and three others - 42nd (Brown), 50th (Filner) and 17th (Farr) are in jeopardy.

Conversely, Democrats have an excellent chance to defeat Ken Calvert in the 43rd, a decent chance to win the open 24th district, and outside prospects to win the 10th (Baker), 4th (Doolittle), and 27th (Moorhead).

OHIO

Perhaps the most vulnerable state in the nation for Democratic incumbents is Ohio, where a Republican sweep of the state is quite possible. At the top of the ticket, Republican Governor, George Voinovich is a certain winner. Moreover, Joel Hyatt is running far behind Mike DeWine in the Senate race.

Democratic incumbents in serious jeopardy include: David Mann (1st), Ted Strickland (6th), Sherrod Brown (13th), Tom Sawyer (14th) and Eric Fingerhut (19th). Democrats have a fair chance to unseat Martin Hoke in the 10th district.

MICHIGAN

Second only to Ohio in terms of potential Democratic losses, several incumbents are in jeopardy: Bart Stupak (1st), Dale Kildee (9th) Sander Levin (12th). Also Democrats must defend open seats: Bob Carr (6th) and William Ford (13th).

PENNSYLVANIA

Both parties have to defend several seats in Pennsylvania. Democratic incumbents Tim Holden (6th), Marjorie Mezvinsky (13th) and Paul McHale (15th), are in serious jeopardy. An open seat vacated by Democrat Austin Murphy, will likely be retained by Frank Mascara.

Republicans will have a hard time retaining open seats vacated by senate candidate Rick Santorum (18th) and gubernatorial candidate Tom Ridge (21st).

WASHINGTON

Protecting an inflated 8-1 advantage in the House delegation, several Democratic incumbents are in difficulty. Jay Inslee (4th) and Mike Kreidler (9th) are in serious trouble. Speaker Foley (5th) and the 2nd district, vacated by Al Swift, are potentially marginal. Maria Cantwell (1st) is a strong favorite to win again, in a Republican district. Jolene Unoseld, previously highly marginal, benefitted from the withdrawal of her Republican opponent, but still faces a potential right-wing challenge from a write-in candidate.